

During the progress of agitation of various waterway projects, differences frequently arise among citizens of the same locality or among the engineers who are considering such projects. The National Rivers and Harbors Congress stands aloof in these controversies and awaits the time until local differences shall be assimilated into a common purpose and until the engineers have reached a final conclusion as to the engineering details. When that time arrives, such a project becomes entitled to the active aid of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. However, there occasionally comes to the front some great enterprise upon which the country or different sections of the country may be divided. Under such a condition the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has sponsored the proposition that the giving of publicity to all sides of the question would not only be in the public interest but would best subserve the cause of eventual unity. Publicity not only conserves the merits of a public problem but, in a more important sense, it tends to remove the causes of friction by eliminating existing prejudices and concentrating the public mind upon the real merits of the problem under discussion.

I represent in part a State whose people are vitally interested in water transportation. The lower Mississippi flows by its border. The city of New Orleans is gradually establishing itself as the natural gateway to the sea for that group of dominant States located in the Mississippi Valley. I speak with some knowledge of the subject of water transportation. I have had occasion for many years to observe and to acknowledge the intrinsic value and the notable part which the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has performed in the improvement of waterways and the promotion of transportation. It is a pleasure to bespeak from the various local organizations of the country, and from those unselfish groups of citizens committed to the cause, their whole-hearted support of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate sundry messages from the President of the United States, transmitting nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Reports of committees are in order.

#### REPORT OF A MILITARY NOMINATION

Mr. REED, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported the nomination of Brig. Gen. Frank Thomas Hines, Reserve Corps of the Army, to be a brigadier general, reserve, from September 7, 1930, which was placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The calendar is now in order.

#### LONDON NAVAL TREATY

The Chief Clerk announced as first in order on the calendar Treaty Executive XI (71st Cong., 2d sess.), for the limitation and reduction of naval armaments signed April 22, 1930.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under a unanimous-consent agreement, the treaty will go over.

#### CUSTOMS SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William H. Ellison to be collector of customs, district No. 25, headquarters at San Diego, Calif.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the nominations of sundry postmasters.

Mr. PHIPPS. I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be notified.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The consideration of the calendar is completed; and, without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations this day made.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McNARY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, June 27, 1930, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

*Executive nominations received by the Senate June 26, 1930*

##### SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

Julius Wadsworth, of Connecticut, now a Foreign Service officer, unclassified, and a vice consul of career, to be also a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

#### APPOINTMENT IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY

##### GENERAL OFFICER

*To be brigadier general, reserve*

Brig. Gen. Frank Thomas Hines, reserve, from September 7, 1930.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 26, 1930*

##### COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

William H. Ellison, district No. 25, headquarters at San Diego, Calif.

##### POSTMASTERS

##### CALIFORNIA

Lucy B. Hopkins, Calistoga.  
Mary C. Rathyen, Encinitas.

##### IOWA

Leeta Knapp, Aurora.  
Russell I. Polly, Whiting.

##### LOUISIANA

Clement Bourgeois, Erath.  
George M. Tannehill, Uria.  
Irma L. Batey, Wisner.

##### MISSOURI

Lewis B. McKean, Blairstown.  
Aaron D. Peterson, Browning.  
Fred F. Hall, Hallsville.

##### NORTH CAROLINA

James E. Green, Mount Gilead.  
John D. Massey, Selma.

##### NORTH DAKOTA

Ruth C. Borman, Alamo.

##### OHIO

Lewis C. Crawford, Shreve.  
Clarence M. Jennings, Sterling.

##### PENNSYLVANIA

Harry W. Thatcher, Bethlehem.

##### SOUTH DAKOTA

Melvin P. Juel, Canton.  
Harry M. Bardon, Rockham.  
Elsie M. Romereim, Roslyn.  
Mary V. Breene, Seneca.  
William O. Brennan, Sherman.  
Mary J. Carr, Stratford.

##### TENNESSEE

Robert D. Lindsay, Coal Creek.  
Carrie S. Waters, Goodlettsville.

##### VIRGINIA

Clementine M. Wright, Sharps.

##### WISCONSIN

Cornelia F. Whitcomb, Bloomington.  
Nels O. Neprud, Coon Valley.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, June 26, 1930

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Incline our hearts to keep Thy law, O Lord, and work in us the spirit of sincere repentance. Turn our faces upward and ever keep them in the light. Because of our tendencies we ask Thee for faith and courage to meet life's uncertainties and to perform its duties with determination. May Thy will be done in all things. With Thy blessing upon us we pray that this day may be filled with peace and with those deeds which our minds and hearts have cherished. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 47. An act for the relief of the State of New York;  
H. R. 494. An act for the relief of Catherine White;

H. R. 495. An act for the relief of Katherine Frances Lamb and Elinor Frances Lamb;

H. R. 528. An act for the relief of Clarence C. Cadell;

H. R. 531. An act for the relief of John Maika;

H. R. 794. An act for the relief of C. B. Smith;

H. R. 913. An act for the relief of Belle Clopton;

H. R. 917. An act for the relief of John Panza and Rose Panza;

H. R. 919. An act for the relief of the father of Catharine Kearney;

H. R. 1063. An act for the relief of Alice Hipkins;

H. R. 1066. An act for the relief of Evelyn Harris;

H. R. 2156. An act authorizing the sale of all of the interest and rights of the United States of America in the Columbia Arsenal property, situated in the ninth civil district of Maury County, Tenn., and providing that the net fund be deposited in the military post construction fund, and for the repeal of Public Law No. 542 (H. R. 12479), Seventieth Congress;

H. R. 2170. An act for the relief of Clyde Cornish;

H. R. 2222. An act for the relief of Laurin Gosney;

H. R. 2782. An act for the relief of Elizabeth B. Dayton;

H. R. 4564. An act for the relief of E. J. Kerlee;

H. R. 5627. An act relating to the naturalization of certain aliens;

H. R. 6227. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Lynn;

H. R. 12343. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to accept donations of sites for public buildings; and

H. J. Res. 253. Joint resolution to provide for the expenses of a delegation of the United States to the sixth meeting of the Congress of Military Medicine and Pharmacy to be held at Budapest in 1931.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1214. An act granting compensation to Philip R. Roby;

S. 1603. An act to provide for the exchange of lands of the United States in the Philippine Islands for lands of the Philippine government;

S. 4149. An act to add certain lands to the Ashley National Forest in the State of Wyoming;

S. 4248. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to convey the Fort Griswold tract to the State of Connecticut;

S. 4435. An act for the relief of James Williamson and those claiming under or through him;

S. 4665. An act extending the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at Sistersville, Tyler County, W. Va.;

S. 4671. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Montana, the counties of Roosevelt, Richland, and McCone, or any of them, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Poplar, Mont.;

S. 4683. An act to authorize the sale of all of the right, title, interest, and estate of the United States of America in and to certain lands in the State of Michigan;

S. 4687. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Aurora, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge from Stolps Island in the Fox River at Aurora, Ill., to connect with the existing highway bridge across the Fox River north of Stolps Island;

S. 4690. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Montana or the county of Roosevelt, or both of them, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Poplar, Mont.;

S. 4708. An act to amend the act entitled "An act providing for a study regarding the construction of a highway to connect the northwestern part of the United States with British Columbia, Yukon Territory, and Alaska in cooperation with the Dominion of Canada," approved May 15, 1930; and

S. 4735. An act to increase the salary of the Commissioner of Customs.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 887) entitled "An act for the relief of Mary R. Long," disagreed to by the House, agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HOWELL, Mr. McMASTER, and Mr. BLACK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 936) entitled "An act for the relief of Glen D. Tolman," disagreed to by the House, agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HOWELL, Mr. McMASTER, and Mr. BLACK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### SUSPENSION OF THE RULES

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker; by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up privileged Resolution 271.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York calls up a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House Resolution 271

*Resolved*, That it shall be in order beginning on Thursday, June 26, 1930, until the end of the present session of Congress, for the Speaker to recognize Members for motions to suspend the rules.

Mr. POU rose.

Mr. SNELL. I yield to the gentleman. What time does he desire?

Mr. POU. Thirty minutes.

Mr. SNELL. I will yield to him whatever time he may need.

Mr. Speaker, all the debate necessary for the passage of this bill has been going on on the floor of the House and in the corridors for the last 48 hours. There is nothing new in the procedure to present a resolution of this character at this time in the session. Very often when we know that we are practically at the end of a session when the date is not definitely decided upon, and in order to facilitate the business of the House, a resolution of this character is passed.

I want to say in all frankness that the purpose of reporting this resolution to-day is to clear the decks as soon as possible for the passage of World War veterans' legislation and adjourn the House and go home.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Certainly.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman kindly give the House some information as to what the new veterans' legislation is to be, and where we can get a copy of it?

Mr. CELLER. Can the gentleman tell when will be brought up the Wagner unemployment bill?

Mr. SNELL. I can not answer.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I understand the proposed new veterans' legislation will be brought up in such shape that you can not change it by dotting an "i" or crossing a "t." Is that the plan?

Mr. SNELL. That is the plan.

Mr. BLANTON. Very well. The responsibility is on the administration.

The SPEAKER. What arrangement has been made between the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. SNELL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina 30 minutes.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, owing to circumstances over which I have no control, I would decline to take the floor at this time were it not for the fact that this is the last opportunity any of us will have to make an appeal to you for the uncompensated disabled veterans of the World War before the time comes to vote on the veto, which you will vote on without permitting us any time for debate.

Do not be deceived. You are being made the goats to-day, you men before me. You voted for the veterans' bill when it carried at least \$50,000,000 a year more than it carries to-day.

Mr. SPEAKS. Not all of us.

Mr. RANKIN. All but a few; only 47 of you.

Mr. MORGAN. Forty-nine.

Mr. RANKIN. No; 47 Republicans and 2 misguided Democrats. You voted for it when it carried \$50,000,000 a year more than it does to-day.

You are asked to-day to vote to kill veterans' relief and you will not escape responsibility. I want to tell you that the few men who claim to be the higher-ups in a certain institution—who are betraying the American Legion and who are betraying the disabled ex-service men—are not going to get by with it in this year of our Lord 1930.

What do you propose to do? You are asked to kill veterans' relief when you pass this innocuous bill, by which you would give a veteran with anything under a 50 per cent disability from tuberculosis, cancer, paralysis, or any other disease, \$18 a month.

Mr. KVALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. For a question.

Mr. KVALE. Will the gentleman include in his statement the word "permanent"?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; it must be permanent to get even \$18.



Why, the gentleman from Nebraska, for whom I have great admiration, because he is one Republican who would rather be wrong than regular on veterans' relief, is always against anything we try to pass.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. RANKIN. I do not mean that seriously, of course.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then the gentleman ought to retract the statement.

Mr. RANKIN. I will correct the statement. I do not mean the gentleman would always rather be wrong than regular, but the gentleman will be regular at the expense of being wrong on veterans' relief.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not object to what the gentleman said about my being regular, but the gentleman said I was against veterans' relief, and that statement I challenge.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not say that the gentleman is always against veterans' relief, but he voted against the passage of this bill in the beginning, he voted against the Spanish War pension, and he voted to sustain the veto of the President, and he is going to vote to sustain this veto, and 10 days after to-day, when they come back with a veto to this bill, after the Senate has pumped some life into it, the chances are 6 to 1 the gentleman will be against that.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the gentleman yield? That is not a fair statement. I did not vote against the Spanish War veterans' bill and I did not vote to sustain the veto, and the gentleman's statement about that is about as accurate as a number of other statements the gentleman is making. [Applause on Republican side.]

Mr. RANKIN. I think the gentleman is wrong. I think the gentleman showed up in the list, but if he did not, I will certainly correct my statement.

Mr. SIMMONS. I would suggest the gentleman get his facts straight before he tells anything to the House.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not want to misrepresent the gentleman from Nebraska, and if he did not vote to sustain the veto on the Spanish War veterans' bill, of course, I will correct that statement, because I do not want to misrepresent him.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then I suggest to the gentleman that he go over on his side and sit down until he knows what he is talking about with regard to this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. RANKIN. I know the gentleman from Nebraska is opposed to this bill. He knows that when he votes for the innocuous bill that is going to follow this one, he is voting for something that will not bring relief to the disabled veterans.

The gentleman from Nebraska goes on to say that these Spanish War veterans are old men. I want you to know that these World War men are invariably helpless and many of them are dying for lack of relief. Are you going to wait until they become disabled by reason of old age before you come to their relief?

You propose to sustain the President's veto in order that you may pass this innocuous bill, and when you do that, the Senate is going to raise the rates to where it will cost \$50,000,000 more than the bill before you. A vote to sustain this veto is a vote against veterans' relief at this session of the Congress, and your leaders know it. [Applause.]

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the reason for the passage of this rule is to make it possible to introduce and pass a fair, equitable piece of veterans' legislation immediately after the President's veto is sustained.

I believe the House will sustain the President's veto just as firmly as I believe that that veto will be before us, and the President will state the truth in that veto if he says that the bill that has come to him is the most unfair, inequitable, unjust, and vicious piece of legislation that has ever been passed in any parliamentary body for the alleged relief of service men. [Applause.]

It will not do what some of you have thought it would do. It will take 40 per cent of the men suffering from diseases, certain selected diseases, and give them, with their hospitalization, what is a pension of \$225 a month.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. No; I want to finish this statement, and I have only five minutes.

The other 60 per cent will get nothing.

These service men in the United States are just as smart as anyone on the floor of this House. By the time that bill is analyzed in each American Legion post, in each post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, in each Disabled American Veterans' post—and it will be analyzed—they will know that that bill "gold-bricked" them and they will know that it was unfair.

You can search your files of your own cases to verify this statement, and I want to say that the Members of this House, both Republicans and Democrats, are doing a good job in trying to get things done for service men. I do not know of a man who is not working for them whether he is a Republican or a Democrat. There is no politics in that work, but when you analyze that measure, as it passed the House and the Senate, you will see that it would not take care of 40 per cent of your cases, while the bill which I will at once present to the House will take care of 200,000 men and will cost \$50,000,000 a year.

This vote will defeat more Members of Congress than any piece of legislation that has been here in my time, because when some smart service man who analyzes these unfair laws becomes a candidate against some one who voted against the President's veto and calls attention to the fact that that bill would take care of men with acidosis and gout and hemophilia and obesity and a variety of diseases of that kind, but would not help a man who lost both arms in a coal mine and is needy, and does not help the man who has heart trouble and is needy, or does not help a man who has any of the other 60 per cent of diseases, and he names this Member of Congress as "Acidosis John Smith" or "Obesity John Smith," or whatever his name be, that man will be defeated, because the service men of this country want legislation that will treat every man alike. These service men are just as good citizens to-day as they were when they were in the service.

It is time for action, not talk, and upon this veto this will be my final word. I hope to pass a bill that the Congress can be proud of and not one that is discriminatory.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts rose.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I do not want any remarks of others in my time, and for that reason I close my statement at this time. [Applause.]

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the lady from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have listened with a great deal of attention to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. I hope every Member who voted for the veterans' bill realizes exactly what he has been saying. Certainly it is an indictment against every man who voted for the veterans' bill, and I think we have a considerable majority. [Applause.]

During the past five years I have voted on many bills, some very good bills, others not because they were good but because they were the best to be had from a controlled majority, and were always so written that it was difficult to separate the good from the bad—one such example is the rivers and harbors bill. I have observed during my five years that wherever the bill had to do with large financial interests it had an assured easy passage, but whenever the human equation was uppermost it encountered rough seas.

In the case of the Rankin bill that would benefit so many deserving helpless men—helpless because they answered the call to make America a safe place in which to live; helpless because of their great love of country and of their fellow Americans, you and I and the millions who shouted and cheered them on their way to slaughter and death. We told them they would never be forgotten because they were brave men; yes, they were brave men, or, should I say, brave boys, for many of them had come from the schoolrooms and were looking at life for the first time, and to-day are wrecks lying in hospitals waiting for their day of release to come and wondering why they never had a chance to live. Our President was supposed to be a great humanitarian in those days. He was much advertised everywhere as feeding the hungry children of Europe. Of course the fact of his having been sent by a real humanitarian—a President who furnished all the necessary men, women, and money to work with was lost sight of—but to-day we know why the man who was charged with the task was successful. It was because he was following a great leader, taking orders from a man with a human heart—President Wilson. [Applause.]

To-day the man who profited by that human leadership is in the place of authority.

We had hoped and expected great things from his leadership, and we are amazed that the first real leadership displayed by him is to whip into line men who were disposed a few weeks ago to keep their promise to the boys they sent to filth and misery and death—living death—just a few short years ago. And if this were not bad enough, the excuse offered—for it is the real excuse—is even worse—a deficit in the Treasury—the same old cry that always arises when the machinery of state is interfered with by the humanitarians in Congress. For, thank God, we still have a few humanitarians in Congress, but their number is dwindling.

Who thought of the deficit in the Treasury when war was declared? When we were asked to give until it hurt? And



we did. And to-day many of the profiteers of those days are fearful that their ill-gotten wealth may be taxed a few extra dollars if this bill to help the men responsible for that wealth should become a law. And a President with his ear to the ground only hears the threat of the taxpayer when it is raised in opposition to a human cry. The richest country in the world is unable to pay its war debt to the men who contributed all they had to contribute to a cause they believed sacred, but to-day is not sacred because it may react upon the purse strings of a Treasury that must be considered above and beyond all human sentiment. [Applause.]

We are told the President's veto is to be sustained on this bill. Men who only a few days ago voted in favor of the bill are now arrayed against it. The President will win his first victory at the expense of the disabled veteran.

It is reported that the Johnson bill, H. R. 13174, said to be sponsored by the American Legion, is to be substituted for the Rankin bill. I have not read the provisions contained in this bill, but it is safe to assume that the heart of the Rankin bill—the presumptive clause—is stricken out and a small pension provided. My inclination is to vote against the bill, for it does not permit amendments—being considered under suspension. If I decide to vote in favor of the bill it will be simply because it is the best we can get from a powerfully controlled majority.

It is my hope that the Senate will use its independent thought to correct the inequalities of this bill, should it pass the House.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER].

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I represent a congressional district in which is located a National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers. Since I have been a Member of Congress I have devoted my personal attention to many thousand claims to see that the veterans received every benefit to which they were entitled under the law, nothing more and nothing less.

I shall be very pleased to vote to sustain the veto of the President of the United States to-day [applause] and cast my vote for the bill, which will come before the House under suspension of the rules on a motion by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. [Applause.]

This is not the time and place to discuss this legislation from the point of what was promised the veterans when they were overseas. The question which is squarely before us is whether we are going to pass legislation granting additional benefits to our World War veterans which does not discriminate in favor of a few and against the many. [Applause.]

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I can not put my stamp of approval on the bill as it passed the other body, which will single out a few diseases and hold them service connected when they show up before January 1, 1930, and absolutely ignore many hundreds of other diseases.

Why, under the bill which will be vetoed a man who gains in avoirdupois over nine years after the war will be able to receive service connection and compensation. Several of my colleagues and myself would no doubt receive service connection and compensation because of being overweight, which we gained a number of years after our discharge from active military service.

I feel confident that a great majority of the World War veterans—particularly those who are discriminated against—will approve and stand by the President's veto and favor the new bill which will be offered by the chairman of the World War Veterans' Committee [Mr. JOHNSON]. [Applause.]

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I do not propose to discuss this rule in reference to its effect on veterans' legislation. That has been ably brought to your attention by the gentleman from Texas, our Democratic leader. I have opposed this resolution from the Committee on Rules in that committee and now on the floor for more reasons than that it is directed at jamming through a veterans' bill.

Ordinarily, motions to suspend the rules are not made in order until we have passed a resolution to adjourn, and then during the last six days of the session motions to suspend the rules are in order under the general rules of the House. This special rule to make such motions in order beginning to-day before we have voted to adjourn is directed at much more than the veterans' legislation. Let me call the attention of you friends of labor, you friends of the small merchant, you friends of the farmer, you friends of people generally on both sides of the House to this legislative situation, and if you realize the full purport of it you will vote down this resolution.

On the 11th day of June a rule was reported from the Committee on Rules for the consideration of the Kelly-Capper bill. What is going to be done with that important measure? Will

it be brought up at all or will it be jammed through in some form under suspension of the rules?

On June 14 there was reported out of the Committee on Rules a resolution to consider the border patrol act. What are you going to do with that controversial bill, rivaling in its harshness and its fanatical injustices the Jones law? Will you move to suspend the rules and rush that bill through, vicious as it is, with no opportunity for fair amendment?

On June 20 a resolution was reported out of the Committee on Rules making in order the agricultural bill relating to the branding of jellies and jams. What are you going to do with that bill? Will that be jammed through under a motion to suspend the rules?

On June 20 a rule was reported out to complete consideration of the copyright bill. Will that bill be rushed through under suspension with no opportunity to offer certain necessary amendments?

What are you going to do with the other important legislation still pending before this House, you friends of labor, you friends of the farmer, you friends of your constituents? What are you going to do with the Couzens resolution, S. J. Res. 161? Yesterday or the day before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported that resolution so emasculated by amendments that it is an offense to fairness and to the railroad employees. What are you going to do with that resolution? Jam through that worthless substitute resolution, with no chance to amend it and restore it to its original form? Why, you friends of labor will be compelled to vote down that amended resolution, with no chance to vote for the original Couzens resolution!

What are you going to do with the three unemployment bills, S. 3059, S. 3060, and S. 3061? They have all been reported, perhaps one of them only to-day—but amended out of all recognition as compared with the Senate bills. Are you going to jam those through under a motion to suspend the rules, and make merely a gesture in the matter of unemployment, the most distressing problem of our Nation to-day?

What are you going to do with the other important legislation still pending here?

What are you going to do, for instance, with the 44-hour bill, S. 471, which passed the Senate on April 1, and was reported to this House on May 16, and still not acted on? What are you going to do with the half-holiday bill, H. R. 6603, which was reported to this House on April 7? What are you going to do with the prevailing rate of wage bill, H. R. 9232, which was reported to this House on April 15? What are you going to do with the customs employees' salary bill, H. R. 12742? What are you going to do with the Dickstein immigration bill, H. R. 5646, reported on March 25, which deservedly unites mothers and fathers? Are you gentlemen going to be restricted in the consideration of all those bills and many others just to meet this one situation in reference to the veterans' bill, a scheme planned and agreed on in the hog-tied Republican caucus the other night—to meet a situation at the dictation of the President, who should not interfere with a coordinate branch of the Government? Are you going to deny to the House of Representatives the right to consider all these and much other important legislation affecting labor and the farmers and the people generally of the United States? If you are really satisfied to go back to your people after being a party to that un-American method of legislation—if you are, perhaps some people may consider you unfit to serve in the greatest deliberative legislative body in the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I think I have used most of my time. I ask the gentleman from New York to yield me five minutes.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from North Carolina five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for six minutes.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I am obliged to my friend, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, who is always fair. Mr. Speaker, the stage has been set for the veto message which probably has already left the White House. I read very carefully what the President of the United States had to say with respect to the World War veterans' legislation. He summed it up in the statement that the legislation is bad legislation. I wondered if that could be true. I looked at the Record and I found that when the veterans' bill was considered by the House, 324 men said that it was good legislation and only 49 men said that it was bad legislation. I read of the action in another body and by 10 to 1 they said that this legislation was not bad legislation, and yesterday this House by unanimous vote put its seal of approval upon the legislation which the President said is bad. After all, that is merely an opinion. In the face of the record that has been made here, it is hard to see how gentlemen can find sufficient cause to turn about face and vote exactly opposite to the way they voted when the legislation was under



consideration. You would better get your one-third vote in this Congress because in all human probability you will not have it in the next. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

On Memorial or Armistice Day many of those present have in glowing terms acknowledged the debt this Nation owes to the men who won the war. To-day you will have opportunity to partly discharge that debt.

Mr. Speaker, I am for this legislation, heart and soul. I say it is righteous legislation. Almost 500 Members of this Congress have by their votes said that the bill which the President will veto is a righteous measure.

If I had a drop of blood in my body that was opposed to it, I would ask some surgeon to make an incision and take that drop of blood out. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In almost every community in America there is to-day some ex-service man who did his duty but who is excluded by existing law, who will be cared for by the bill the President will veto. Some of these men have become charges on charity. When I remember that before the war the wealth of the United States was \$189,000,000,000 and that after the war it was more than twice that, I say it is as little as we can do to deal liberally with the men who went across the sea and won the war fully a year before anybody thought it was possible. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The President vetoed the Spanish War veterans' bill, but you passed that measure over his veto, and to-day it is the law of the land. How will you who voted to pass that bill over a presidential veto explain a vote to-day to sustain a veto of this bill? It may be that you will defeat this legislation by securing a minority vote here. But for the great power of the President, there would probably be less than 100 votes to uphold his veto.

It may be that under gag rule you will put through some substitute; but there will be an accounting day, and that day will be in the coming November. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say just one word in reply to my colleague from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR]. If the gentleman is as familiar with all of the actions of the House in the last few years as I think he must be, he would not have made the statement he made on the floor. In the first place, we have brought in a similar rule a great many times making suspensions in order the last few days of a session. Furthermore, we had suspensions beginning to-morrow by unanimous consent. Probably the only suspension that will come up to-day will be the one in connection with veterans' legislation. So that there is nothing hidden or concealed. I told the House frankly in my first statement the reason that we have brought this in to-day.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. When unanimous consent was obtained for suspension of the rules beginning to-morrow, the situation in reference to putting through the veterans' legislation was not before the House.

Mr. SNELL. Yes; but it is before the House now, and we have a rule to make it in order, and the only purpose of bringing in that rule is to put it through. That is what I told the House when I first took the floor. The gentleman said there was something hidden about it and there is not, and every one knows it.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. SNELL. Yes; let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 228, nays 139, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 76]

YEAS—228

Ackerman	Campbell, Iowa	Culkin	Freeman
Adkins	Campbell, Pa.	Dallinger	French
Allen	Carter, Calif.	Darrow	Garber, Okla.
Andresen	Carter, Wyo.	Davenport	Garber, Va.
Andrew	Chalmers	Dempsey	Gibson
Arentz	Chase	Denison	Gifford
Ayres	Chindblom	Dickinson	Goodwin
Bacharach	Christgau	Doutrich	Graham
Bachmann	Christopherson	Dowell	Guyer
Bacon	Clague	Dunbar	Hadley
Barbour	Clancy	Dyer	Hale
Beedy	Clark, Md.	Eaton, Colo.	Hall, Ill.
Beers	Clarke, N. Y.	Eaton, N. J.	Hall, Ind.
Blackburn	Cochran, Pa.	Elliot	Hall, N. Dak.
Bolton	Cole	Ellis	Halsey
Bowman	Collins	Englebright	Hancock
Brand, Ohio	Colton	Estep	Hardy
Brigham	Connolly	Esterly	Hartley
Britten	Cooper, Ohio	Evans, Calif.	Haugen
Brumm	Coyle	Fenn	Hawley
Buckbee	Craddock	Fitzgerald	Hess
Burdick	Crail	Fort	Hickey
Butler	Cramton	Foss	Hoch
Cable	Crowther	Frear	Hoffman

Hogg	Leavitt	Purnell	Summers, Wash.
Holaday	Leech	Ramey, Frank M.	Swanson
Hooper	Lehlbach	Ramseyer	Swick
Hope	Letts	Ransley	Swing
Hopkins	Luce	Reed, N. Y.	Taber
Houston, Del.	McClintock, Ohio	Reid, Ill.	Taylor, Tenn.
Hudson	McCormick, Ill.	Robinson	Temple
Hull, Morton D.	McFadden	Rogers	Thatcher
Hull, William E.	McLaughlin	Rowbottom	Thompson
Hull, Wis.	McLeod	Sanders, N. Y.	Thurston
Irwin	Maas	Schafer, Wis.	Tilson
Jenkins	Magrady	Schneider	Timberlake
Johnson, Ind.	Manlove	Sears	Tinkham
Johnson, Nebr.	Mapes	Seiberling	Treadway
Johnson, S. Dak.	Martin	Selvig	Turpin
Johnson, Wash.	Menges	Shaffer, Va.	Vestal
Jonas, N. C.	Merritt	Short, Mo.	Vincent, Mich.
Kahn	Michener	Shott, W. Va.	Wainwright
Kearns	Miller	Shreve	Wason
Kelly	Moore, Ohio	Simmons	Watres
Kendall, Ky.	Morgan	Simms	Watson
Kendall, Pa.	Mouser	Sloan	Welch, Calif.
Ketcham	Nelson, Me.	Smith, Idaho	White
Kless	Newhall	Snell	Whitley
Kinzer	Niedringhaus	Snow	Wigglesworth
Knutson	Nolan	Sparks	Williamson
Kopp	O'Connor, Okla.	Speaks	Wolfenden
Kurtz	Palmer	Sproul, Ill.	Wolverton, N. J.
LaGuardia	Parker	Stafford	Wolverton, W. Va.
Lambertson	Perkins	Stobbs	Woodruff
Lampert	Pittenger	Strong, Kans.	Wurzbach
Lankford, Va.	Pratt, Harcourt J.	Strong, Pa.	Wyant
Lea	Pratt, Ruth	Sullivan, Pa.	Yates

NAYS—139

Abernethy	Dickstein	Johnson, Okla.	Palmisano
Allgood	Dominick	Johnson, Tex.	Parks
Almon	Doughton	Jones, Tex.	Patman
Arnold	Douglass, Mass.	Kennedy	Patterson
Aswell	Doxey	Kerr	Pou
Auf der Heide	Drane	Kincheloe	Prall
Bankhead	Drewry	Kvale	Quayle
Bell	Driver	Lanham	Quin
Black	Edwards	Lankford, Ga.	Ragon
Bland	Eslick	Larsen	Rainey, Henry T.
Blanton	Evans, Mont.	Lindsay	Ramspeck
Box	Fisher	Linthicum	Rankin
Boylan	Fitzpatrick	Lozier	Rayburn
Brand, Ga.	Fulmer	Ludlow	Rutherford
Briggs	Gambrill	McClintic, Okla.	Sabath
Browne	Garner	McCormack, Mass.	Sanders, Tex.
Browning	Garrett	McDuffie	Sandlin
Brunner	Gasque	McKeown	Sirovich
Busby	Gavagan	McMillan	Smith, W. Va.
Cainfield	Glover	McSwain	Somers, N. Y.
Cannon	Goldsborough	Mead	Stevenson
Carley	Granfield	Milligan	Stone
Cartwright	Green	Montague	Summers, Tex.
Celler	Greenwood	Mooney	Tarver
Clark, N. C.	Gregory	Moore, Ky.	Tucker
Cochran, Mo.	Griffin	Moore, Va.	Underwood
Connelly	Hall, Miss.	Morehead	Vinson, Ga.
Cooper, Tenn.	Hammer	Nelson, Mo.	Warren
Cox	Hare	Norton	Whitehead
Crisp	Hastings	O'Connell	Whittington
Cross	Hill, Ala.	O'Connor, La.	Wilson
Crosser	Hill, Wash.	O'Connor, N. Y.	Woodrum
Cullen	Howard	Oldfield	Wright
Davis	Huddleston	Oliver, Ala.	Yon
DeRouen	Jeffers	Oliver, N. Y.	

NOT VOTING—61

Aldrich	Finley	Langley	Sproul, Kans.
Baird	Fish	McReynolds	Stalker
Beck	Free	Mansfield	Steagall
Bloom	Fuller	Michaelson	Stedman
Bohn	Golder	Montet	Sullivan, N. Y.
Buchanan	Hudspeth	Murphy	Taylor, Colo.
Burtness	Hull, Tenn.	Nelson, Wis.	Underhill
Byrns	Igoe	Owen	Walker
Collier	James	Peavey	Welsh, Pa.
Cooke	Johnson, Ill.	Porter	Williams
Cooper, Wis.	Johnston, Mo.	Pritchard	Wingo
Corning	Kading	Reece	Wood
Curry	Kemp	Romjue	Zihlman
De Priest	Kiefner	Seger	
Douglas, Ariz.	Korell	Sinclair	
Doyle	Kunz	Spearing	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Wood with Mr. Byrns.  
 Mr. Welsh of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hull of Tennessee.  
 Mr. Sinclair with Mrs. Owen.  
 Mr. Aldrich with Mr. Stegall.  
 Mr. Fish with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.  
 Mr. Golder with Mr. Douglas of Arizona.  
 Mr. Zihlman with Mr. Mansfield.  
 Mr. Beck with Mr. Bloom.  
 Mr. Kiefner with Mr. Fuller.  
 Mrs. Langley with Mr. Kemp.  
 Mr. Bohn with Mr. Stedman.  
 Mr. Murphy with Mr. Wingo.  
 Mr. Seger with Mr. Collier.  
 Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Hudspeth.  
 Mr. Reece with Mr. Romjue.  
 Mr. Johnston of Missouri with Mr. Williams.  
 Mr. Free with Mr. Spearing.  
 Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey with Mr. Sullivan of New York.  
 Mr. Sproul of Kansas with Mr. Montet.  
 Mr. Cooper of Wisconsin with Mr. Corning.  
 Mr. Baird with Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. Nelson of Wisconsin with Mr. Doyle.  
Mr. Finley with Mr. McReynolds.  
Mr. Cooke with Mr. Kunz.  
Mr. James with Mr. Igoe.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, may I submit a unanimous-consent request? The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] generously gave way for to-day the time heretofore granted to him in order that we might proceed with the program. I ask unanimous consent that he may proceed on Friday for 15 minutes. I also ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON] may proceed for five minutes following him.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.  
There was no objection.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 9, 1930:

H. R. 851. An act for the relief of Richard Kirchhoff;  
H. R. 1160. An act for the relief of Henry P. Biehl;  
H. R. 3175. An act to authorize Lieut. Commander James C. Monfort, of the United States Navy, to accept a decoration conferred upon him by the Government of Italy;  
H. R. 3610. An act for the relief of William Geravis Hill;  
H. R. 3801. An act waiving the limiting period of two years in Executive Order No. 4576 to enable the Board of Awards of the Navy Department to consider recommendation of the award of the distinguished-flying cross to members of the Alaskan Aerial Survey Expedition; and  
H. R. 5213. An act for the relief of Grant R. Kelsey, alias Vincent J. Moran.

On June 10, 1930:

H. R. 1053. An act for the relief of Jacob Scott;  
H. R. 1155. An act for the relief of Eugene A. Dubrule;  
H. R. 3118. An Act for the relief of the Marshall State Bank;  
H. R. 3144. An act to amend section 601 of subchapter 3 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia;  
H. R. 3200. An act for the relief of Bessie Blaker;  
H. R. 3257. An act for the relief of Ellen B. Monahan;  
H. R. 5524. An act for the relief of T. J. Hillman;  
H. R. 6071. An act for the relief of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States;  
H. R. 9557. An act to create a body corporate by the name of the "Textile Alliance Foundation";  
H. R. 9806. An act to authorize the construction of certain bridges and to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of other bridges over the navigable waters of the United States;  
H. R. 11228. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct a bridge across the Rock River south of Moline, Ill.;  
H. R. 11240. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River at Pittsburgh, Allegheny County, Pa.;  
H. R. 11282. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Tenth Street in Bettendorf, State of Iowa;  
H. R. 11435. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Rockford, Ill., to construct a bridge across the Rock River at Broadway in the city of Rockford, Winnebago County, State of Illinois; and

H. R. 12131. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Allegheny River at or near Kittanning, Armstrong County, Pa.

On June 11, 1930:

H. R. 977. An act establishing under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice a division of the bureau of investigation to be known as the division of identification and information;  
H. R. 1194. An act to amend the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916, relative to the appointment of pay clerks and acting pay clerks;  
H. R. 1601. An act to authorize the Department of Agriculture to issue two duplicate checks in favor of Utah State treasurer, where the originals have been lost;  
H. R. 2587. An act for the relief of James P. Sloan;  
H. R. 2626. An act for the relief of George Joseph Boydell;  
H. R. 2951. An act granting six months' pay to Frank J. Hale;  
H. R. 5611. An act for the relief of William H. Behling;

H. R. 6348. An act donating trophy guns to Varina Davis Chapter, No. 1980, United Daughters of the Confederacy, Macclenny, Fla.;

H. R. 6591. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to grant to the town of Winthrop, Mass., a perpetual right of way over such land of the Fort Banks Military Reservation as is necessary for the purpose of widening Revere Street to a width of 50 feet;

H. R. 9109. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Jefferson Memorial Association of St. Louis, Mo., the ship's bell, builder's label plate, a record of war services, letters forming ship's name, and silver service of the cruiser *St. Louis* that is now or may be in his custody;

H. R. 9370. An act to provide for the modernization of the United States Naval Observatory at Washington, D. C., and for other purposes;

H. R. 9975. An act for the relief of John C. Warren, alias John Stevens;

H. R. 10662. An act providing for hospitalization and medical treatment of transferred members of the Fleet Naval Reserve and the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve in Government hospitals without expense to the reservist;

H. R. 12236. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes;

On June 12, 1930:

H. J. Res. 181. Joint resolution to amend a joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution giving to discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines a preferred right of homestead entry," approved February 14, 1920, as amended January 21, 1922, and as extended December 28, 1922;

H. R. 976. An act providing that subscription charges for newspapers, magazines, and other periodicals for official use may be paid for in advance;

H. R. 1840. An act for the relief of Gertrude Lustig;

H. R. 2011. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to settle the claims of the owners of the French steamships *P. L. M. 4* and *P. L. M. 7* for damages sustained as the result of collisions between such vessels and the U. S. S. *Henderson* and U. S. S. *Lake Charlotte*, and to settle the claim of the United States against the owners of the French steamship *P. L. M. 7* for damages sustained by the U. S. S. *Pennsylvania* in a collision with the *P. L. M. 7*; and

H. R. 8589. An act for the relief of Charles J. Ferris, major, United States Army, retired.

On June 13, 1930:

H. J. Res. 270. A joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to defray the expenses of the participation of the Government in the Sixth Pan American Child Congress, to be held at Lima, Peru, July, 1930;

H. R. 1086. An act for the relief of George W. Posey;

H. R. 6130. An act to exempt the Custer National Forest from the operation of the forest homestead law, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8372. An act to provide for the construction and equipment of an annex to the Library of Congress; and

H. R. 12205. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and so forth, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

On June 14, 1930:

H. R. 972. An act to amend an act entitled "An act providing for the revision and printing of the index to the Federal Statutes," approved March 3, 1927;

H. R. 4020. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to Congress on the advisability and practicability of establishing a national park to be known as the Upper Mississippi National Park in the States of Iowa, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota;

H. R. 5190. An act to enable the Postmaster General to authorize the establishment of temporary or emergency star-route service from a date earlier than the date of the order requiring such service;

H. R. 6651. An act for the relief of John Golombiewski;

H. R. 11082. An act granting a franking privilege to Helen H. Taft; and

H. R. 11143. An act to create in the Treasury Department a bureau of narcotics, and for other purposes.

On June 16, 1930:

H. R. 6186. An act for the relief of Frank Storms;

H. R. 11274. An act to amend section 305, chapter 8, title 28, of the United States Code relative to the compilation and print-



ing of the opinions of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals; and

H. J. Res. 340. Joint resolution extending the time for the assessment, refund, and credit of income taxes for 1927 and 1928 in the case of married individuals having community income.

On June 17, 1930:

H. J. Res. 289. Joint resolution providing for the participation of the United States in the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the siege of Yorktown, Va., and the surrender of Lord Cornwallis on October 19, 1781, and authorizing an appropriation to be used in connection with such celebration, and for other purposes;

H. R. 827. An act for the relief of Homer C. Rayhill;

H. R. 885. An act for the relief of George F. Newhart, Clyde Hahn, and David McCormick;

H. R. 969. An act to amend section 118 of the Judicial Code to provide for the appointment of law clerks to United States circuit judges;

H. R. 2030. An act to authorize an appropriation for the purchase of land adjoining Fort Bliss, Tex.;

H. R. 2667. An act to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8591. An act for the relief of Henry Spight;

H. R. 8855. An act for the relief of John W. Bates;

H. R. 9425. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to donate a bronze cannon to the city of Martins Ferry, Ohio;

H. R. 11903. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Niagara Frontier Bridge Commission, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the east branch of the Niagara River at or near the city of Niagara Falls, N. Y.;

H. R. 11933. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Niagara Frontier Bridge Commission, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the east branch of the Niagara River at or near the city of Tonawanda, N. Y.;

H. R. 12348. An act to provide for the partial payment of the expenses of foreign delegates to the Eleventh Annual Convention of the Federation Interalliee Des Anciens Combattants, to be held in the District of Columbia in September, 1930; and

H. R. 12440. An act providing certain exemptions from taxation for Treasury bills.

On June 18, 1930:

H. R. 692. An act for the relief of Ella E. Horner;

H. R. 1499. An act for the relief of C. O. Crosby;

H. R. 4469. An act for the relief of Second Lieut. Burgo D. Gill;

H. R. 6124. An act to provide for the reconstruction of the Army and Navy Hospital at Hot Springs, Ark.;

H. R. 7464. An act for the relief of Robert R. Strehlow;

H. R. 7484. An act for the relief of Edward R. Egan;

H. R. 9300. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to hire vehicles from village delivery carriers;

H. R. 11007. An act to amend the act of August 24, 1912 (ch. 389, par. 7, 37 Stat. 556; U. S. C., title 39, sec. 631), making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913;

H. R. 11273. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Des Moines River at or near Croton, Iowa; and

H. R. 11679. An act to provide for acquiring and disposition of certain properties for use or formerly used by the Lighthouse Service.

On June 19, 1930:

H. R. 3203. An act to authorize the city of Salina and the town of Redmond, State of Utah, to secure adequate supplies of water for municipal and domestic purposes through the development of subterranean water on certain public lands within said State;

H. R. 7299. An act for the relief of Hannah Odekirk;

H. R. 8479. An act to amend section 7 of Public Act No. 391, Seventieth Congress, approved May 15, 1928;

H. R. 9109. An act for the relief of the successors of Luther Burbank; and

H. R. 11134. An act to amend section 91 of the act entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900, as amended.

On June 20, 1930:

H. R. 515. An act for the relief of Jackson D. Wissman;

H. R. 2876. An act for the relief of J. C. Peixotto;

H. R. 10375. An act to provide for the retirement of disabled nurses of the Army and Navy;

H. J. Res. 280. Joint resolution to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union; and

H. J. Res. 353. Joint resolution providing for an investigation and report, by a committee to be appointed by the President, with reference to the representation at and participation in the Chicago World's Fair Centennial Celebration, known as the Century of Progress Exposition, on the part of the Government of the United States and its various departments and activities.

On June 21, 1930:

H. R. 8836. An act for the relief of the French Co. of Marine and Commerce;

H. R. 8881. An act to carry out the recommendation of the President in connection with the late-claims agreement entered into pursuant to the settlement of war claims act of 1928;

H. R. 10668. An act to authorize issuance of certificates of repatriation to certain veterans of the World War;

H. R. 10780. An act to transfer certain lands to the Ouachita National Forest, Ark.;

H. R. 11784. An act to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Rocky Mountain National Park, in the State of Colorado; and

H. J. Res. 300. Joint resolution to permit the Pennsylvania Gift Fountain Association to erect a fountain in the District of Columbia.

On June 23, 1930:

H. R. 593. An act for the relief of First Lieut. John R. Bailey;

H. R. 1029. An act for the relief of Arthur D. Story, assignee of Jacob Story, and Harris H. Gilman, receiver for the Murray & Thurgutha plant of the National Motors Corporation;

H. R. 1481. An act for the relief of James C. Fritzen;

H. R. 1494. An act for the relief of Maj. O. S. McCleary, United States Army, retired;

H. R. 7205. An act for the relief of Lamirah F. Thomas;

H. R. 7822. An act amending section 2 and repealing section 3 of the act approved February 24, 1925 (43 Stat. 964, ch. 301), entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of commissioners by the Court of Claims and to prescribe their powers and compensation," and for other purposes;

H. R. 7924. An act for the erection of tablets or markers and the commemoration of Camp Blount and the Old Stone Bridge, Lincoln County, Tenn.;

H. R. 7997. An act authorizing the purchase by the Secretary of Commerce of additional land for the Bureau of Standards of the Department of Commerce;

H. R. 8127. An act for the relief of J. W. Nelson;

H. R. 8958. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Alaska Railroad;

H. R. 9198. An act to remove cloud as to title of lands at Fort Lytleton, S. C.;

H. R. 11432. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the enlarging of the Capitol Grounds," approved March 4, 1929, relating to the condemnation of land;

H. R. 11700. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mahoning River at or near Cedar Street, Youngstown, Ohio;

H. R. 11786. An act to legalize a bridge across the Arkansas River at the town of Ozark, Franklin County, Ark.;

H. R. 11934. An act authorizing the Monongahela Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Monongahela River at or near the town of Star City, W. Va.;

H. R. 11966. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Lake Sabine at or near Port Arthur, Tex.;

H. R. 11974. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Beaufort County Lumber Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Lumber River at or near Fair Bluff, Columbus County, N. C.

On June 24, 1930:

H. J. Res. 311. Joint resolution for the participation of the United States in an exposition to be held at Paris, France, in 1931;

H. R. 669. An act for the relief of Seth J. Harris;

H. R. 745. An act for the relief of B. Frank Shetter;

H. R. 1312. An act for the relief of J. W. Zornes;

H. R. 3764. An act for the relief of Ruban W. Riley;

H. R. 7643. An act to establish a term of the District Court of the United States for the District of Nevada at Las Vegas, Nev.;

H. R. 11050. An act to transfer Willacy County in the State of Texas from the Corpus Christi division of the southern district of Texas to the Brownsville division of such district; and

H. R. 12447. An act to extend hospital facilities to certain retired officers and employees of the Lighthouse Service and to improve the efficiency of the Lighthouse Service.

On June 25, 1930:

H. R. 1306. An act for the relief of Charles W. Byers.



VETO MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT—WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION (H. DOC. NO. 495)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

*To the House of Representatives:*

I am returning herewith House bill 10381 without approval.

One of the most repugnant tasks which can fall to this office is to disapprove of measures intended to benefit our sick or disabled men who have served our country in war. Perhaps as much as any other person, I have full realization of the task, the hardships, and the dangers to which the Nation ordered its sons. In sentiment and in sympathy I should desire no greater satisfaction than to support just measures which are proposed for their benefit. But I want a square deal between veterans—not unjust discriminations between special groups, and I do not want wasteful or unnecessary expenditures.

The country already generously provides for the 280,000 men whose health or earning power is shown to have been impaired by their service in the war and for 91,000 dependents of the men who suffered or died. That is and should be a first charge upon the Nation.

This measure, except for a small part, adds nothing to aid of veterans wounded or disabled in the war. It is a radical departure from our full commitment to provide compensation to men for war disability into the field of pension to men who have incurred disabilities as the incident of civil life since the war and having no valid relation to their military service. It provides that in respect to veterans who between the years 1925 and 1930 shall have become afflicted with any one of an extensive category of diseases and thus disabled, there is established a "presumption" that these diseases originated from their service and that they should be "compensated" or pensioned upon the basis of men who suffered as the result of actual military service. This provision would give war-disability benefits to from 75,000 to 100,000 men who were not disabled as the result of war. In other words, the bill purports to establish that men who have enjoyed good health for a minimum of 7 years (from 1918 to 1925) since the war, or a maximum of 12 years (to 1930), and who have then become afflicted, have received such affliction from their war service.

I am informed by the Director of the Veterans' Bureau that the medical council of the bureau, consisting of most eminent physicians and surgeons, supported by the whole experience of the bureau, agree conclusively that this legal "presumption" that affliction from diseases mentioned in the bill between 1925 and 1930 is not a physical possibility and that the presumption constitutes a wholly false and fictitious basis for legislation in veterans' aid. This is confirmed by a recent resolution of so eminent a body as the American Medical Association.

The spectacle of the Government practicing subterfuge in order to say that what did not happen in the war did happen in war impairs the integrity of government, reduces the respect for government, and undermines the morale of all the people.

The practical effects of this enactment of a fictitious "presumption" into law are widespread. It creates a long train of injustices and inequalities. The first is to place men of this class who have in fact been disabled in civil life since the war upon the same basis as the men who were wounded in battle and suffered the exposures of the trenches. But a second injustice immediately arises. The Veterans' Bureau estimates that there are somewhere in the neighborhood of 380,000 possible cases of disability incurred in civil life since the war amongst the 4,300,000 living veterans. By this legislation all except somewhere between 75,000 and 100,000 of these men are excluded from this aid by the Government except for benefits which they already receive by hospitalization, the bonus, and insurance. This bill would, therefore, create a preferred group of one-third among the men who are suffering from disabilities incurred in civil life since the war.

The further injustice of this bill may become more apparent when it is realized that men who were enrolled in the Army who remained but comparatively a few days or weeks in service, without ever leaving their home States, will receive aid upon the same basis as those men who passed through the Battle of the Argonne. They may come upon the Government pay roll for life in case of total disability at rates from \$80 to \$200 per month. Beyond this again, under the provisions of this bill as it affects the existing law, many thousands of men who have in fact incurred their disabilities in civil life may receive larger allowances from the Government than the men actually wounded at the front.

It has been contended that the Government has the right to disprove the "presumption" that any of the long list of diseases enumerated in this bill are not of war origin. But the burden of such proof is placed upon the Government, and

all the experience of the Veterans' Bureau shows that such rebuttal is ineffective, as the evidence surrounding such questions as a rule can not be secured or made clear and conclusive.

Additional inequalities and injustices arise from certain other provisions. At the present time any veteran who may become ill or disabled as the incident of civil life is received in Government hospitals if there is a vacant bed, and given free treatment. This bill provides that such cases received in the hospitals shall in addition to free treatment also receive cash allowances, and that a dependency allowance under certain restrictions shall be made to their families. The number of men of this type who are taken into Federal hospitals depends upon the number of beds unoccupied by men actually disabled from illness or injury incurred during the war, that being the major purpose of the hospitals. It is, therefore, a matter of accident or luck as to whether a given veteran, ill from sickness arising in civil life, is able to secure these facilities. An ill and destitute veteran may not have the luck to find a bed, in which case he neither receives treatment nor does his family receive an allowance. Yet a veteran of independent means may be fortunate enough to secure both. This is neither equitable nor just.

This bill departs from the traditional basis upon which we have given support to the veterans of the Civil and Spanish Wars. We have always recognized the principle in that legislation that the veterans of less than 90 days' service, unless they have a disability incurred in line of duty, should be excluded from benefits because such men have not been called to actual war service. Recently in the Spanish War veterans' bill, against my protest, this was reduced to 70 days, but in the bill we are here considering there is no requirement whatever of service, and a man with one day's service after enrollment is entitled to all of the benefits. Here we create at once an injustice between veterans of different wars and between men whose lives were endangered and those who incurred no risks.

There is no provision in this bill against men of independent means claiming benefits from the Government for these disabilities arising in civil life. Surely it is of vital importance to the taxpayers, who directly or indirectly include all veterans themselves, that they shall not be called upon to contribute to such men of independent means. Moreover, it is equally important that the amount the Nation can find for this burden should not be dissipated over those without need but should be devoted to those who are in actual need. A declaration of destitution and pauperism from veterans is not necessary. I have never advocated such a declaration. It can, however, easily be provided in any legislation that the Secretary of the Treasury should return to the Veterans' Bureau a statement of the men who are exempt from income taxes at some level to be determined by Congress.

I have already protested to Congress in other connections against the inclusion of compensation for disablement due to vicious habits. This bill contemplates compensation for some misconduct disabilities the whole conception of which must be repugnant to decent family life.

No government can proceed with intelligence that does not take into account the fiscal effects of its actions. The bill in a wasteful and extravagant manner goes far beyond the financial necessities of the situation. General Hines, after renewed examination, reports that this bill as finally passed will cost \$110,000,000 the first year; that this will increase to an annual burden of \$235,000,000 and continue during the life of these veterans. The provision in the bill for review after three years, in my view, will never relieve us from commitments once entered upon. And this is but a portion of the costs, because the bill as enacted contains indirect liabilities to the Government of uncertain but very large possibilities. The amendments to section 19 of the World War veterans' act will increase the liabilities of the Government by a total of over \$40,000,000, and the amendments to section 206 or 209 of the act will increase liabilities to a substantial but uncertain amount.

These costs are beyond the capacity of the Government at the present time without increased taxation. They are larger than the veterans have themselves proposed.

Beyond this, and of vital importance, are the potential obligations which are created and must finally be met. For instance, if we attempt to set up a system of relief to veterans suffering from disabilities incurred in civil life by establishing the "presumptions" of this bill, then we can not with fairness stop with a preferred group of 75,000 to 100,000 men. We shall have to extend these "presumptions" step by step over the entire group of 380,000. The additional cost upon the basis of the first 100,000 could readily add another \$150,000,000 or \$200,000,000 a year. If we are going to make cash allowances to men disabled from sickness or accident arising in civil life now in



Government hospitals, together with cash allowances to their families, we must consider the fate of others in the same class who are so unfortunate as not to be able to find an empty bed. There are approximately 13,000 such cases of illness arising from civil life in the Federal hospitals at the present time. The medical council of the Veterans' Bureau states that there are at least 89,000 such cases that will eventually have a right to hospitalization if beds are available. In addition to hospitals now building, we should need to expend another \$140,000,000 in construction to take care of such further cases, and then be faced with an annual maintenance cost of about 60,000,000, all in addition to what we are providing now. To this again must be added the cash allowance to the further number of men for whom we make additional beds available in hospitals, and the allowance to their families, which will in itself aggregate a further great annual sum.

It is disagreeable to point out these potentialities lest it be thought that the Government begrudges its veterans. I am not presenting these reasons in any such sense but in order that Congress and the country may be apprised of the real magnitude of the burden imposed and of the injustices arising from this legislation.

Even if I were able to overlook these burdens, for monetary considerations are indeed secondary, I can not overlook the discriminations and injustices which this legislation creates, together with its failure to meet the real need that exists to-day among our veterans in a fundamental and sound manner.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 26, 1930.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread upon the Journal. The question is, Will the House on reconsideration pass the bill, the veto of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, the House is ready to act on the message of the President, which correctly characterizes this unjust, unfair, and discriminatory bill, and for that reason without further discussion, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House on reconsideration, pass the bill, the veto of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, the vote on the President's veto must be by yeas and nays. As many as are in favor of overruling the veto will, as their names are called, answer "aye"; as many as are in favor of supporting the President will, as their names are called, answer "no."

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GARNER (interrupting the roll call). Mr. Speaker, that is not, under the Constitution, the motion before the House, and can not be the motion. The vote is to pass this bill, the President's veto to the contrary notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. That is what the Chair said.

Mr. GARNER. Well, the Chair did not say so at all.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did say so twice.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not in order in interrupting during a roll call.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 182, nays 188, not voting 58, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

YEAS—182

Abernethy	Christgau	Esterly	Huddleston
Adkins	Clark, N. C.	Evans, Mont.	Hull, William E.
Allgood	Connery	Fisher	Hull, Wis.
Almon	Connolly	Fitzpatrick	Irwin
Arnold	Cooper, Tenn.	Frear	Jeffers
Aswell	Cox	Fulmer	Johnson, Okla.
Auf der Heide	Craddock	Gambrell	Johnson, Tex.
Bankhead	Crail	Garber, Okla.	Jones, Tex.
Bell	Crisp	Garner	Kendall, Pa.
Black	Cross	Garret	Kennedy
Bland	Crosser	Gasque	Kerr
Blanton	Cullen	Gavagan	Kincheloe
Box	Davis	Glover	Kinzer
Boylan	DeRouen	Goldsborough	Kopp
Brand, Ga.	Dickstein	Granfield	Kurtz
Briggs	Dominick	Green	Kvale
Browne	Doughton	Greenwood	Lampert
Browning	Douglas, Ariz.	Gregory	Lanham
Brumm	Douglass, Mass.	Griffin	Lankford, Ga.
Brunner	Doutrich	Hall, Ill.	Larsen
Busby	Dowell	Hall, Miss.	Lea
Butler	Doxey	Hammer	Leech
Campbell, Iowa	Drane	Hare	Lindsay
Canfield	Drewry	Hartley	Linthicum
Cannon	Driver	Hastings	Lozier
Carley	Dunbar	Haugen	Ludlow
Cartwright	Edwards	Hill, Ala.	McClintic, Okla.
Celler	Englebright	Hill, Wash.	McCormack, Mass.
Chase	Eslick	Howard	McDuffie

McKeown	Oliver, N. Y.	Rutherford	Thurston
McMillan	Palmisano	Sabath	Tucker
McSwain	Parks	Sanders, Tex.	Turpin
Mead	Patman	Sandlin	Underwood
Milligan	Patterson	Schneider	Vinson, Ga.
Montague	Pou	Shreve	Warren
Mooney	Prall	Sirovich	Welch, Calif.
Moore, Ky.	Pritchard	Smith, W. Va.	Whitehead
Moore, Va.	Quayle	Somers, N. Y.	Wilson
Morehead	Quin	Stevenson	Wolfenden
Nelson, Mo.	Ragon	Stone	Wolverton, N. J.
Norton	Rainey, Henry T.	Strong, Pa.	Woodrum
O'Connell	Ramspeck	Summers, Tex.	Wright
O'Connor, La.	Rankin	Swanson	Wyant
O'Connor, N. Y.	Rayburn	Swing	Yon
Oldfield	Reid, Ill.	Tarver	
Oliver, Ala.	Robinson	Taylor, Tenn.	

NAYS—188

Ackerman	Dyer	Kendall, Ky.	Sanders, N. Y.
Allen	Eaton, Colo.	Ketcham	Schafer, Wis.
Andresen	Eaton, N. J.	Kless	Sears
Andrew	Elliott	Knutson	Seiberling
Arentz	Ellis	Korell	Selvig
Ayres	Estep	LaGuardia	Shaffer, Va.
Bacharach	Evans, Calif.	Lambertson	Short, Mo.
Bachmann	Fenn	Lankford, Va.	Shott, W. Va.
Bacon	Fort	Leavitt	Simmons
Baird	Foss	Lehlbach	Simms
Barbour	Freeman	Letts	Sloan
Beedy	French	Luce	Smith, Idaho
Beers	Garber, Va.	McClintock, Ohio	Snell
Blackburn	Gibson	McCormick, Ill.	Snow
Bolton	Gifford	McFadden	Sparks
Bowman	Goodwin	McLaughlin	Speaks
Brand, Ohio	Graham	McLeod	Sproul, Ill.
Brigham	Guyer	Maas	Stafford
Britten	Hadley	Magrady	Stobbs
Buckbee	Hale	Manlove	Strong, Kans.
Burdick	Hall, Ind.	Mapes	Sullivan, Pa.
Cable	Hall, N. Dak.	Martin	Summers, Wash.
Campbell, Pa.	Halsey	Menges	Swick
Carter, Calif.	Hancock	Merritt	Taber
Carter, Wyo.	Hardy	Michener	Temple
Chalmers	Hawley	Miller	Thatcher
Chindblom	Hess	Moore, Ohio	Thompson
Christopherson	Hickey	Morgan	Tilson
Clague	Hoch	Mouser	Timberlake
Clancy	Hoffman	Nelson, Me.	Tinkham
Clark, Md.	Hogg	Newhall	Trendway
Clarke, N. Y.	Holaday	Niedringhaus	Vestal
Cochran, Mo.	Hooper	Nolan	Vincent, Mich.
Cochran, Pa.	Hope	O'Connor, Okla.	Wainwright
Cole	Hopkins	Palmer	Wason
Colton	Houston, Del.	Parker	Watres
Cooper, Ohio	Hudson	Perkins	Watson
Coyle	Hull, Morton D.	Pittenger	White
Cramton	Jenkins	Pratt, Harcourt J.	Whitley
Crowther	Johnson, Ind.	Pratt, Ruth	Whittington
Culkin	Johnson, Nebr.	Purnell	Wigglesworth
Dallinger	Johnson, S. Dak.	Ramey, Frank M.	Williamson
Darrow	Johnson, Wash.	Ramsayer	Wolverton, W. Va.
Davenport	Jonas, N. C.	Ransley	Wood
Dempsey	Kahn	Reed, N. Y.	Woodruff
Denison	Kearns	Rogers	Wurzbach
Dickinson	Kelly	Rowbottom	Yates

NOT VOTING—58

Aldrich	Finley	Kunz	Spearing
Beck	Fish	Langley	Sproul, Kans.
Bloom	Fitzgerald	McReynolds	Stalker
Bohn	Free	Mansfield	Stegall
Buchanan	Fuller	Michaelson	Stedman
Burness	Golder	Montet	Sullivan, N. Y.
Byrns	Hudspeth	Murphy	Taylor, Colo.
Collier	Hull, Tenn.	Nelson, Wis.	Underhill
Collins	Igoe	Owen	Walker
Cooke	James	Peavey	Welsh, Pa.
Cooper, Wis.	Johnson, Ill.	Porter	Williams
Corning	Johnston, Mo.	Reece	Wingo
Curry	Kading	Romjue	Zihlman
De Priest	Kemp	Seger	
Doyle	Kiefner	Sinclair	

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this veto:

Mrs. Langley and Mr. Bloom (override) with Mr. Free (sustain).

Mr. Sinclair and Mr. Johnson of Illinois (override) with Mr. Golder (sustain).

Mr. Welsh of Pennsylvania and Mr. Zihlman (override) with Mr. Beck (sustain).

Mr. Sullivan of New York and Mr. Kemp (override) with Mr. Fish (sustain).

Mr. Curry and Mrs. Owen (override) with Mr. Kiefner (sustain).

Mr. Wingo and Mr. Stegall (override) with Mr. Cooke (sustain).

Mr. Romjue and Mr. Corning (override) with Mr. Aldrich (sustain).

Mr. Sproul of Kansas and Mr. DePriest (override) with Mr. Johnston of Missouri (sustain).

Mr. Byrns and Mr. Hull of Tennessee (override) with Mr. Bohn (sustain).

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state that three of my colleagues from Tennessee, Mr. BYRNS, Mr. HULL, and Mr. McREYNOLDS are unavoidably absent. I am directed by each one of them to state that if they were present they would vote "aye" on this roll call.

Mr. SANDERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. WILLIAMS, is unavoidably absent. On this roll call he would vote "aye." The same also applies to the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. ROMJUE.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen from Texas, Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. BUCHANAN, are unavoidably absent. If present, they would vote "aye."

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. NELSON is absent. If he were present, he would vote "no."

Mr. KENDALL of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. WALKER, is unable to be present. If present, he would have voted "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. Two-thirds not having voted in the affirmative, the bill is rejected, and the message is referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and ordered printed, together with the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 13174) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 13174. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 5 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended (sec. 426, title 38, U. S. C.), be hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. The director, subject to the general direction of the President, shall administer, execute, and enforce the provisions of this act, and for that purpose shall have full power and authority to make rules and regulations, not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, which are necessary or appropriate to carry out its purposes, and shall decide all questions arising under this act; and all decisions of questions of fact affecting any claimant to the benefits of Titles II, III, or IV of this act shall be conclusive except as otherwise provided herein. All officers and employees of the bureau shall perform such duties as may be assigned them by the director. All official acts performed by such officers or employees specially designated therefor by the director shall have the same force and effect as though performed by the director in person. Wherever under any provision or provisions of the act regulations are directed or authorized to be made, such regulations, unless the context otherwise requires, shall or may be made by the director. The director shall adopt reasonable and proper rules to govern the procedure of the divisions and to regulate and provide for the nature and extent of the proofs and evidence and the method of taking and furnishing the same in order to establish the right to benefits of compensation, insurance, vocational training, or maintenance and support allowance provided for in this act, the forms of application of those claiming to be entitled to such benefits, the methods of making investigations and medical examinations, and the manner and form of adjudications and awards: *Provided*, That regulations relating to the nature and extent of the proofs and evidence shall provide that due regard shall be given to lay and other evidence not of a medical nature."

SEC. 2. That section 10 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (sec. 434, title 38, U. S. C.), be hereby amended by adding thereto the following paragraphs:

"The director is further authorized to secure such recreational facilities, supplies, and equipment for the use of patients in hospitals, and for employees at isolated stations as he, in his discretion, may deem necessary, and the appropriations made available for the carrying out of the provisions of this section may be expended for that purpose."

SEC. 3. That section 16 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (sec. 442, title 38, U. S. C.), be hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 16. All sums heretofore appropriated for the military and naval insurance appropriation and all premiums collected for the yearly renewable term insurance provided by the provisions of Title III deposited and covered into the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation, shall, where unexpended, be made available for the bureau. All premiums that may hereafter be collected for the yearly renewable term insurance provided by the provisions of Title III hereof shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury for the credit of this appropriation. Such sum, including all premium payments, is made available for the payment of the liabilities of the United States incurred under contracts of yearly renewable term insurance made under the provisions of Title III, including the refund of premiums and such liabilities as shall have been or shall hereafter be reduced to judgment in a district court of the United States or in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia. Payments from this appropriation shall be made upon and in accordance with the awards by the director."

SEC. 4. That section 19 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (sec. 445, title 38, U. S. C.), be hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 19. In the event of disagreement as to claim, including claim for refund of premiums, under a contract of insurance between the bureau and any person or persons claiming thereunder an action on the claim may be brought against the United States either in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia or in the district court of the United States in and for the district in which such persons or any

one of them resides, and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon such courts to hear and determine all such controversies. The procedure in such suits shall be the same as that provided in sections 5 and 6 of the Act entitled 'An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States,' approved March 3, 1887, and section 10 thereof so far as applicable. All persons having or claiming to have an interest in such insurance may be made parties to such suit, and such as are not inhabitants of or found within the district in which suit is brought may be brought in by order of the court to be served personally or by publication or in such other reasonable manner as the court may direct. In all cases where the bureau acknowledges the indebtedness of the United States upon any such contract of insurance and there is a dispute as to the person or persons entitled to payment, a suit in the nature of a bill of interpleader may be brought by the bureau in the name of the United States against all persons having or claiming to have any interest in such insurance in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia or in the district court in and for the district in which any of such claimants reside: *Provided*, That no less than 30 days prior to instituting such suit the bureau shall mail a notice of such intention to each of the persons to be made parties to the suit. The circuit courts of appeal and the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia shall respectively exercise appellate jurisdiction and, except as provided in sections 346 and 347, title 28, United States Code, the decrees of the circuit courts of appeal and the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia shall be final.

"No suit shall be allowed under this section unless the same shall have been brought within six years after the right accrued for which the claim is made prior to May 29, 1929, whichever is the later date: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this section it shall be deemed that the right accrued on the happening of the contingency on which the claim is founded: *Provided further*, That this limitation is suspended for the period elapsing between the filing in the bureau of the claim sued upon and the denial of said claim by the director. Infants, insane persons, or persons under other legal disability, or persons rated as incompetent or insane by the bureau shall have three years in which to bring suit after the removal of their disabilities. If suit is seasonably begun and fails for defect in process, or for other reasons not affecting the merits, a new action, if one lies, may be brought within a year though the period of limitations has elapsed. Judgments heretofore rendered against the person or persons claiming under the contract of war-risk insurance on the ground that the claim was barred by the statute of limitations shall not be a bar to the institution of another suit on the same claim. No State or other statute of limitations shall be applicable to suits filed under this section.

"In any suit, action, or proceeding brought under the provisions of this act subpoenas for witnesses who are required to attend a court of the United States in any district may run into any other district: *Provided*, That no writ of subpoena shall issue for witnesses living out of the district in which the court is held at a greater distance than 100 miles from the place of holding the same without the permission of the court being first had upon proper application and cause shown. The word 'district' and the words 'district court' as used herein shall be construed to include the District of Columbia and the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

"Attorneys of the bureau when assigned to assist in the trial of cases, and employees of the bureau when ordered in writing by the director to appear as witnesses shall be paid the regular travel and subsistence allowance paid to other employees when on official travel status.

"Part time and fee basis employees of the bureau, in addition to their regular travel and subsistence allowance, when ordered in writing by the director to appear as witnesses in suits under this section, may be allowed, within the discretion and under written orders of the director, a fee in an amount not to exceed \$20 per day.

"Employees of the United States Veterans' Bureau who are subpoenaed to attend the trial of any suit, under the provisions of this act, as witnesses for plaintiffs shall be granted official leave for the period they are required to be away from the bureau in answer to such subpoenas.

"The term 'claim' as used in this section, means any writing which alleges permanent and total disability at a time when the contract of insurance was in force, or which uses words showing an intention to claim insurance benefits; and the term 'disagreement' means a denial of the claim by the director or some one acting in his name on an appeal to the director. This section, as amended, with the exception of this paragraph, shall apply to all suits now pending against the United States under the provisions of the war risk insurance act, as amended, or the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended."

SEC. 5. That a new subdivision be added to section 21 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (sec. 450, title 38, U. S. C.), to be known as subdivision (3), and to read as follows:

"(3) All or any part of the compensation or insurance the payment of which is suspended or withheld under this section may, in the discretion of the director, be paid temporarily to the person having custody and control of the incompetent or minor beneficiary to be used solely for the benefit of such beneficiary, or, in the case of an incom-



petent veteran, may be apportioned to the dependent or dependents, if any, of such veteran. Any part not so paid and any funds of a mentally incompetent or insane veteran not paid to the chief officer of the institution in which such veteran is an inmate or apportioned to his dependent or dependents under the provisions of section 202 (7) of this act may be ordered held in the Treasury to the credit of such beneficiary. All funds so held shall be disbursed under the order and in the discretion of the director for the benefit of such veteran or his dependents. Any balance remaining in such fund to the credit of any veteran may be paid to him if he recovers and is found competent, or otherwise to his guardian, curator, or conservator, or, in the event of his death, to his personal representative, except as provided in section 26 of this act: *Provided*, That payment will not be made to his personal representative if, under the law of the State of his last legal residence, his estate would escheat to the State: *Provided further*, That any funds in the hands of a guardian, curator, conservator, or person legally vested with the care of the veteran or his estate, derived from compensation, automatic or term insurance payable under said acts, which under the law of the State wherein the veteran had his last legal residence would escheat to the State, shall escheat to the United States and shall be returned by such guardian, curator, conservator, or person legally vested with the care of the veteran or his estate, less legal expenses of any administration necessary to determine that an escheat is in order, to the bureau, and shall be deposited to the credit of the current appropriations provided for payment of compensation and insurance."

Sec. 6. That section 28 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (sec. 453, title 38, U. S. C.), be hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 28. There shall be no recovery of payments from any person who, in the judgment of the director, is without fault on his part and where, in the judgment of the director, such recovery would defeat the purpose of benefits otherwise authorized or would be against equity and good conscience. No disbursing officer shall be held liable for any amount paid by him to any person where the recovery of such amount is waived under this section.

"When under the provisions of this section the recovery of a payment made from the United States Government life insurance fund is waived, the United States Government life insurance fund shall be reimbursed for the amount involved from the current appropriation for military and naval insurance.

"This section, as amended, shall be deemed to be in effect as of June 7, 1924."

Sec. 7. That section 30 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (sec. 456, title 38, U. S. C.), be hereby amended by adding thereto a new subdivision to be known as subdivision (e), and to read as follows:

"(e) The director may authorize an inspection of bureau records by duly authorized representatives of the organizations designated in or approved by him under section 500 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe."

Sec. 8. That a new section be added to Title I of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, to be known as section 37, and to read as follows:

"Sec. 37. Checks properly issued to beneficiaries and undelivered for any reason shall be retained in the files of the bureau until such time as delivery may be accomplished, or until three full fiscal years have elapsed after the end of the fiscal year in which issued."

Sec. 9. That a new section be added to Title I of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, to be known as section 38, and to read as follows:

"Sec. 38. The director is hereby authorized to purchase uniforms for all personnel employed as watchmen, elevator operators, and elevator starters in the Arlington Building, city of Washington, D. C."

Sec. 10. That a new section be added to Title I of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, to be known as section 39, and to read as follows:

"Sec. 39. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to and accumulate in the War Department in the city of Washington, D. C., all records and files containing information regarding medical and services records of veterans of the World War: *Provided*, That the necessary appropriation to accomplish the transfer of such records and files is hereby authorized."

Sec. 11. That section 200 of the World War veterans act, 1924, as amended (sec. 471, title 38, U. S. C.), be hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 200. For death or disability, resulting from personal injury suffered or disease contracted in the military or naval service on or after April 6, 1917, and before July 2, 1921, or for an aggravation or recurrence of a disability existing prior to examination, acceptance, and enrollment for service, when such aggravation was suffered or contracted in, or such recurrence was caused by, the military or naval service on or after April 6, 1917, and before July 2, 1921, by any commissioned officer or enlisted man, or by any member of the Army Nurse Corps (female), or of the Navy Nurse Corps (female), when employed in the

active service under the War Department or Navy Department, the United States shall pay to such commissioned officer or enlisted man, member of the Army Nurse Corps (female), or of the Navy Nurse Corps (female), or women citizens of the United States who were taken from the United States by the United States Government and who served in base hospitals overseas, or, in the discretion of the director, separately to his or her dependents, compensation as hereinafter provided; but no compensation shall be paid if the injury, disease, aggravation, or recurrence has been caused by his own willful misconduct: *Provided*, That no person suffering from paralysis, paresis, or blindness shall be denied compensation by reason of willful misconduct, nor shall any person who is helpless or bedridden as a result of any disability be denied compensation by reason of willful misconduct. That for the purposes of this section and section 304 every such officer, enlisted man, or other member employed in the active service under the War Department or Navy Department who was discharged or who resigned prior to July 2, 1921, and every such officer, enlisted man, or other member employed in the active service under the War Department or Navy Department on or before November 11, 1918, who on or after July 2, 1921, is discharged or resigns, shall be conclusively held and taken to have been in sound condition when examined, accepted, and enrolled for service, except as to defects, disorders, or infirmities made of record in any manner by proper authorities of the United States at the time of, or prior to, inception of active service, to the extent to which any such defect, disorder, or infirmity was so made of record: *Provided*, That an ex-service man who is shown to have or, if deceased, to have had, prior to January 1, 1925, neuropsychiatric disease, spinal meningitis, an active tuberculosis disease, paralysis agitans, encephalitis lethargica, or amoebic dysentery developing a 10 per cent degree of disability or more in accordance with the provisions of subdivision (4) of section 202 of this act, shall be presumed to have acquired his disability in such service between April 6, 1917, and July 2, 1921, or to have suffered an aggravation of a preexisting neuropsychiatric disease, spinal meningitis, tuberculosis, paralysis agitans, encephalitis lethargica, or amoebic dysentery in such service between said dates, and said presumption shall be conclusive in cases of active tuberculosis disease and spinal meningitis, but in all other cases said presumption shall be rebuttable by clear and convincing evidence; but nothing in this proviso shall be construed to prevent a claimant from receiving the benefits of compensation and medical care and treatment for a disability due to these diseases of more than 10 per cent degree (in accordance with the provisions of subdivision (4) of section 202 of this act) on or subsequent to January 1, 1925, if the facts in the case substantiate his claim: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this act shall apply only to ex-service men who entered the service, were inducted or who applied for enlistment, prior to November 12, 1918, and their dependents, but payment to any persons now receiving benefits under the act shall not be discontinued by reason of this proviso for a period of one year following approval of this amendatory act.

On and after the date of the approval of this amendatory act any honorably discharged ex-service man who entered the service prior to November 11, 1918, and served 90 days or more during the World War, and who is or may hereafter be suffering from a 25 per cent or more permanent disability, as defined by the director, not the result of his own willful misconduct, which was not acquired in the service during the World War, or for which compensation is not payable, shall be entitled to receive a disability allowance at the following rates: 25 per cent permanent disability, \$12 per month; 50 per cent permanent disability, \$18 per month; 75 per cent permanent disability, \$24 per month; total permanent disability, \$40 per month. No disability allowance payable under this paragraph shall commence prior to the date of the passage of this amendatory act or the date of application therefor, and such application shall be in such form as the director may prescribe: *Provided*, That no disability allowance under this paragraph shall be payable to any person not entitled to exemption from the payment of a Federal income tax for the year preceding the filing of application for such disability allowance under this paragraph. In any case in which the amount of compensation hereafter payable to any person for permanent disability under the provisions of this act is less than the maximum amount of the disability allowance payable for a corresponding degree of disability under the provisions of this paragraph, then such person may receive such disability allowance in lieu of compensation. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to allow the payment to any person of both a disability allowance and compensation during the same period; and all payments made to any person for a period covered by a new or increased award of disability allowance or compensation shall be deducted from the amount payable under such new or increased award. As used in Titles I and V of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, the term "compensation" shall be deemed to include the term "disability allowance" as used in this paragraph.

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed, upon the request of the director to transmit to the director a certificate stating whether the veteran who is applying for a disability allowance under this paragraph was entitled to exemption from the payment of a Federal in-



come tax for the year preceding the filing of application for the disability allowance, and such certificate shall be conclusive evidence of the facts stated therein.

SEC. 12. That section 201, subdivisions (f) and (1), of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended (section 472, title 38, United States Code), be hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) If there is a dependent mother (or dependent father), \$20, or both, \$30. The amount payable under this subdivision shall not exceed the difference between the total amount payable to the widow and children and the sum of \$75: *Provided*, That in case there is both a dependent mother and a dependent father, the amount payable to them shall not be less than \$20. Such compensation shall be payable, whether the dependency of the father or mother or both arises before or after the death of the person: *Provided*, That the status of dependency shall be determined as of the first day of each year, and the director is authorized to require a submission of such proof dependency as he, in his discretion, may deem necessary: *Provided further*, That upon refusal or neglect of the claimant or claimants to supply such proof of dependency in a reasonable time the payment of compensation shall be suspended or discontinued.

"(1) If death occur or shall have occurred subsequent to April 6, 1917, and before discharge or resignation from the service, the United States Veterans' Bureau shall pay for burial and funeral expenses and the return of body to his home a sum not to exceed \$100, as may be fixed by regulation. Where a veteran of any war, including those women who served as Army nurses under contracts between April 21, 1898, and February 2, 1901, who was not dishonorably discharged, dies after discharge or resignation from the service, the director, in his discretion and with due regard to the circumstances of each case, shall pay, for burial and funeral expenses and the transportation of the body (including preparation of the body) to the place of burial, a sum not exceeding \$107 to cover such items and to be paid to such person or persons as may be fixed by regulations: *Provided*, That when such person dies while receiving from the bureau compensation or vocational training, or in a national military home, the above benefits shall be payable in all cases: *Provided further*, That where such person, while receiving from the bureau medical, surgical, or hospital treatment, or vocational training, dies away from home and at the place to which he was ordered by the bureau, or while traveling under orders of the bureau, or in a national military home, the above benefits shall be payable in all cases and in addition thereto the actual and necessary cost of the transportation of the body of the person (including preparation of the body) to the place of burial, within the continental limits of the United States, its Territories, or possessions, and including also, in the discretion of the director, the actual and necessary cost of transportation of an attendant: *Provided further*, That no accrued pension, compensation, or insurance due at the time of death shall be deducted from the sum allowed: *Provided further*, That the director may, in his discretion, make contracts for burial and funeral services within the limits of the amounts allowed herein without regard to the laws prescribing advertisement for proposals for supplies and services for the United States Veterans' Bureau: *Provided further*, That section 5, title 41, of the United States Code, shall not be applied to contracts for burial and funeral expenses heretofore entered into by the director so as to deny payment for services rendered thereunder, and all suspensions of payment heretofore made in connection with such contracts are hereby removed, and any and all payments which are now or may hereafter become due on such contracts are hereby expressly authorized: *Provided further*, That no deduction shall be made from the sum allowed because of any contribution toward the burial which shall be made by any State, county, or municipality, but the aggregate of the sum allowed plus such contribution or contributions shall not exceed the actual cost of the burial.

"Where a veteran of any war, including those women who served as Army nurses under contracts between April 21, 1898, and February 2, 1901, who was not dishonorably discharged, dies after discharge or resignation from the service, the director shall furnish a flag to drape the casket of such veteran and afterwards to be given to his next of kin regardless of the cause of death of such veteran."

SEC. 13. That subdivisions (3) and (5) of section 202 of the World War Veterans' act, 1924, as amended (secs. 473, 478, 479, title 38, U. S. C.), be hereby amended to read as follows:

"(3) If and while the disability is rated as total and permanent, the rate of compensation shall be \$100 per month: *Provided, however*, That the permanent loss of the use of both feet, or both hands, or of both eyes, or of one foot and one hand, or of one foot and one eye, or of one hand and one eye, or the loss of hearing of both ears, or the organic loss of speech, or becoming permanently helpless or permanently bedridden, shall be deemed to be total permanent disability: *Provided further*, That the compensation for the loss of the use of both eyes shall be \$150 per month, and that compensation for the loss of the use of both eyes and one or more limbs shall be \$200 per month: *Provided further*, That for double total permanent disability the rate of compensation shall be \$200 per month.

"That any ex-service man shown to have a tuberculous disease of compensable degree, and who has been hospitalized for a period of one

year, and who in the judgment of the director will not reach a condition of arrest by further hospitalization, and whose discharge from hospitalization will not be prejudicial to the beneficiary or his family, and who is not, in the judgment of the director, feasible for training, shall, upon his request, be discharged from hospitalization and rated as temporarily totally disabled, said rating to continue for the period of three years: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this subdivision shall deny the beneficiary the right, upon presentation of satisfactory evidence, to be adjudged to be permanently and totally disabled: *Provided further*, That in addition to the compensation above provided, the injured person shall be furnished by the United States such reasonable governmental, medical, surgical, and hospital services, including payment of court costs and other expenses incident to proceedings heretofore or hereafter taken for commitment of mentally incompetent persons to hospitals for care and treatment of the insane, and shall be furnished with such supplies, including wheel chairs, artificial limbs, trusses, and similar appliances, as the director may determine to be useful and reasonably necessary, which wheel chairs, artificial limbs, trusses, and similar appliances may be procured by the bureau in such manner, either by purchase or manufacture, as the director may determine to be advantageous and reasonably necessary: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to affect the necessary military control over any member of the Military or Naval Establishments before he shall have been discharged from the military or naval service: *Provided further*, That where any person entitled to the benefits of this paragraph has heretofore been hospitalized in a State institution, the United States Veterans' Bureau is hereby authorized to reimburse such person, or his estate, where payment has been made to the State out of the funds of such person, or to reimburse the State or any subdivision thereof where no payment has been made for the reasonable cost of such services from the date of admission.

"There shall be paid to any person who suffered the loss of the use of a creative organ or one or more feet or hands in the active service in line of duty between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, compensation of \$25 per month, independent of any other compensation which may be payable under this act: *Provided, however*, That if such disability was incurred while the veteran was serving with the United States military forces in Russia, the dates herein stated shall extend from April 6, 1917, to April 1, 1920.

"(5) If the disabled person is so helpless as to be in need of a nurse or attendant, such additional sum shall be paid, but not exceeding \$50 per month, as the director may deem reasonable."

SEC. 14. That subdivision (7) of section 202 of the World War Veterans' act, 1924, as amended (secs. 480, 481, title 38, U. S. C.), be hereby amended to read as follows:

"(7) Where any disabled person having neither wife, child, nor dependent parent shall, after July 1, 1924, have been maintained by the Government of the United States for a period or periods amounting to six months in an institution or institutions, and shall be deemed by the director to be insane, the compensation for such person shall thereafter be \$20 per month so long as he shall thereafter be maintained by the bureau in an institution; and such compensation may, in the discretion of the director, be paid to the chief officer of said institution to be used for the benefit of such person: *Provided, however*, That in any case where the estate of such veteran derived from funds paid under the War Risk Insurance Act, as amended, and/or the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, equals or exceeds \$3,000, payment of the \$20 per month shall be discontinued until the estate is reduced to \$3,000: *Provided further*, That if such person shall recover his reason and shall be discharged from such institution as competent, such additional sum shall be paid him as would equal the total sum by which his compensation has been reduced or discontinued through the provisions of this subdivision.

"All or any part of the compensation of any mentally incompetent inmate of an institution may, in the discretion of the director, be paid to the chief officer of said institution to be properly accounted for and to be used for the benefit of such inmate, or may, in the discretion of the director, be apportioned to wife, child or children, or dependent parents in accordance with regulations.

"That any ex-service person shown to have had a tuberculous disease of a compensable degree, who in the judgment of the director has reached a condition of complete arrest of his disease, shall receive compensation of not less than \$50 per month: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this provision shall deny a beneficiary the right to receive a temporary total rating for six months after discharge from a one year's period of hospitalization: *Provided further*, That no payments under this provision shall be retroactive, and the payments hereunder shall commence from the date of the passage of this act or the date the disease reaches a condition of arrest, whichever be the later date.

"The director is hereby authorized and directed to insert in the rating schedule a minimum rating of permanent partial 25 per cent for arrested or apparently cured tuberculosis."

SEC. 15. (1) That so much of the second sentence of subdivision (10) of section 202 of the World War Veterans' act, 1924, as amended (sec. 484, title 38, U. S. C.), as precedes the first proviso thereof, be hereby amended to read as follows:



"The director is further authorized, so far as he shall find that existing Government facilities permit, to furnish hospitalization and necessary traveling expenses incident to hospitalization to veterans of any war, military occupation, or military expedition, including those women who served as Army nurses under contracts between April 21, 1898, and February 2, 1901, and including persons who served overseas as contract surgeons of the Army at any time during the Spanish-American War, not dishonorably discharged, without regard to the nature or origin of their disabilities."

(2) That the following new paragraph be added to subdivision (10) of section 202 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (sec. 484, title 38, U. S. C.), to read as follows:

"For the purposes of this section the Spanish-American War shall be construed to mean service between April 21, 1898, and July 4, 1902, and the term 'veteran' shall be deemed to include those persons retired or otherwise not dishonorably separated from the active list of the Army or Navy."

SEC. 16. That subdivision (15) of section 202 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (sec. 489, title 38, U. S. C.), be hereby amended to read as follows:

"(15) That any person who is now receiving a gratuity or pension from the United States under existing law shall not receive compensation under this section unless he shall first surrender all claim to further payments of such gratuity or pension, except as hereafter provided and in subdivision (7) of section 201: *Provided*, That in the event of surrender of pension as hereinbefore set forth, any disability incurred in the military service of the United States, by reason of which said pension would be payable, shall be evaluated in accordance with the provisions of subdivision (4), section 202, and shall be payable as compensation under this act: *Provided further*, That such compensation rating shall be combined with any other compensation rating awarded by reason of active service in the World War."

SEC. 17. That section 206 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (sec. 495, title 38, U. S. C.), be hereby repealed.

SEC. 18. That section 209 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (sec. 498, title 38, U. S. C.), be hereby repealed.

SEC. 19. That section 210 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (sec. 499, title 38, U. S. C.), be hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 210. That no compensation shall be payable for any period more than one year prior to the date of claim therefor, nor shall increased compensation be awarded to revert back more than six months prior to the date of claim therefor: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to permit the payment of compensation under the World War veterans' act, as amended, for any period prior to June 7, 1924. Except in case of fraud participated in by the beneficiary, no reduction in compensation shall be made retroactive." This section as amended to be effective June 7, 1924.

SEC. 20. That section 212 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (sec. 422, title 38, U. S. C.), be hereby amended by adding thereto the following proviso:

"*Provided further*, That an application for compensation under the war risk insurance act, as amended, shall be deemed to be a claim for compensation under this act, and an application for compensation under the provisions of this act shall be deemed to be a claim for compensation under all subsequent amendments to said act, this proviso to be effective as of June 7, 1924."

SEC. 21. That a new section be added to Title II of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, to be known as section 214, and to read as follows:

"SEC. 214. Where an incompetent receiving disability compensation under the provisions of this act disappears, the director, in his discretion, may pay to the dependents of such veteran the amount of compensation provided in section 201 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, for dependents of veterans."

SEC. 22. That section 301, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (sec. 512, title 38, U. S. C.), be hereby amended to read as follows:

"In case where an insured whose yearly renewable term insurance has matured by reason of total permanent disability is found and declared to be no longer permanently and totally disabled, and where the insured is required under regulations to renew payment of premiums on said term insurance, and where this contingency is extended beyond the period during which said yearly renewable term insurance otherwise must be converted, there shall be given such insured an additional period of two years from the date on which he is required to renew payment of premiums in which to reinstate or convert said term insurance as hereinbefore provided: *Provided*, That where the time for conversion has been extended under the second paragraph of this section because of the mental condition or disappearance of the insured, there shall be allowed to the insured an additional period of two years from the date on which he recovers from his mental disability or reappears in which to convert."

"The insurance, except as provided herein, shall be payable in 240 equal monthly installments: *Provided*, That when the amount of an

individual monthly payment is less than \$5, such amount may in the discretion of the director be allowed to accumulate without interest and be disbursed annually. Provisions for maturity at certain ages, for continuous installments during the life of the insured or beneficiaries, or both, for refund of premiums, cash, loan, paid-up and extended values, dividends from gains and savings, and such other provisions for the protection and advantage of and for alternative benefits to the insured and the beneficiaries as may be found to be reasonable and practicable, may be provided for in the contract of insurance, or from time to time by regulations. All calculations shall be based upon the American Experience Table of Mortality and interest at 3½ per cent per annum, except that no deduction shall be made for continuous installments during the life of the insured in case his total and permanent disability continues more than 240 months. Subject to regulations, the insured shall at all times have the right to change the beneficiary or beneficiaries without the consent of such beneficiary or beneficiaries, but only within the classes herein provided."

SEC. 23. That the last proviso of section 304 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (sec. 515, title 38, U. S. C.), be hereby amended to read as follows: "*And provided further*, That, except as provided in section 301 of the World War veterans' act, as amended, no yearly renewable term insurance shall be reinstated after July 2, 1927."

SEC. 24. That section 307 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (sec. 518, title 38, U. S. C.), be hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 307. All contracts or policies of insurance heretofore or hereafter issued, reinstated, or converted shall be incontestable from the date of issuance, reinstatement, or conversion, except for fraud, non-payment of premiums, or on the ground that the applicant was not a member of the military or naval forces of the United States, and subject to the provisions of section 23: *Provided*, That the insured under such contract or policy may, without prejudicing his rights, elect to make claim to the bureau or to bring suit under section 19 of this act on any prior contract or policy, and if found entitled thereto, shall, upon surrender of any subsequent contract or policy, be entitled to payments under the prior contract or policy: *Provided further*, That this section shall be deemed to be effective as of April 6, 1917, and applicable from that date to all contracts or policies of insurance."

SEC. 25. That section 311 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (sec. 512b, title 38, U. S. C.), be hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 311. The director is hereby authorized and directed to include in United States Government life (converted) insurance policies provision whereby an insured, who is totally disabled as a result of disease or injury for a period of four consecutive months or more before attaining the age of 65 years and before default in payment of any premium, shall be paid disability benefits at the rate of \$5.75 monthly for each \$1,000 of converted insurance in force when total disability benefits become payable. The amount of such monthly payment under the provisions of this section shall not be reduced because of payment of permanent and total disability benefits under the United States Government life (converted) insurance policy. Such payments shall be effective as of the first day of the fifth consecutive month, and shall be made monthly during the continuance of such total disability. Such payments shall be concurrent with or independent of permanent total disability benefits under the United States Government life (converted) insurance policy. In addition to the monthly disability benefits the payment of premiums on the United States Government life (converted) insurance policy and for the total disability benefits authorized by this section shall be waived during the continuance of such total disability. Regulations shall provide for reexaminations of beneficiaries under this section; and, in the event that it is found that an insured is no longer totally disabled, the waiver of premiums and payment of benefits shall cease and the United States Government life (converted) insurance policy, including the total disability provision authorized by this section, may be continued by payment of premiums as provided in said policy and the total disability provision authorized by this section. Neither the dividends nor the amount payable in any settlement under any United States Government life (converted) insurance policy shall be decreased because of disability benefits granted under the provisions of this section. The payment of total disability benefits shall not prejudice the right of any insured, who is totally and permanently disabled, to total permanent disability benefits under his United States Government life (converted) insurance policy: *Provided*, That the provision authorized by this section shall not be included in any United States Government life (converted) insurance policy heretofore or hereafter issued, except upon application, payment of premium by the insured, and proof of good health satisfactory to the director. The benefit granted under this section shall be on the basis of multiples of \$500, and not less than \$1,000 or more than the amount of United States Government life (converted) insurance in force at time of application. The director shall determine the amount of the monthly premium to cover the benefits of this section, and in order to continue such benefits in force



the monthly premiums shall be payable until the insured attains the age of 65 years or until the prior maturity of the policy. In all other respects such monthly premium shall be payable under the same terms and conditions as the regular monthly premium on the United States Government life (converted) insurance policy."

During the reading of the bill the following occurred:

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, this bill is new to all of us. I think the Clerk should read the bill so that we can follow it along and get the information it contains.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk is reading the bill.

Mr. ARNOLD. The Clerk has not been reading all the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will continue the reading of the bill.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; certainly.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is opposed to the bill and demands a second.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could agree on an extension of time.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I think it is entirely unnecessary, Mr. Speaker. I may state that the Finance Committee of the Senate is meeting at 3 o'clock to consider this bill. The gentleman from Mississippi has always been saying "Take care of these boys."

Mr. RANKIN. We would like to have a little time to find out what is in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I can not educate the gentleman on the bill. The report is before the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

A second was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Mississippi 20 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SWICK].

Mr. SWICK. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I asked for these three minutes that I might insert in the RECORD a telegram from the national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Hezekiah N. Duff, and also one from the commander of District of Columbia Department, No. 1, Veterans of Foreign Wars, in Washington, D. C., William L. Thomas. The telegram from Mr. Thomas is as follows:

In accordance with the action of our national commander in his telegram of yesterday, District of Columbia Department, No. 1, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, heartily indorses your action on the pending veterans' relief act. It also indorses the proposed action of the Republican caucus as announced in the local press to pass the pension act at this session of Congress.

The telegram from Mr. Duff reads:

In anticipation of caucus to consider pending veterans' legislation tonight, permit me as commander in chief to emphasize once again that the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is primarily in favor of legislation that will achieve the greatest amount of good for the greatest number.

That is exactly what we have been anxious about during this entire session of Congress. We have been interested in granting some relief to the greatest number of ex-service men. I was very much interested to hear the majority leader [Mr. GARNER], for whom I have the highest regard, make this statement only a few moments ago:

I have never been any fool about soldier legislation. I did not vote for the original compensation. I do not think we owe any such great duty to those men, especially those who remained in the United States, and I am no fool about it.

Reading further from this telegram:

We believe this can only be achieved through adoption of a World War service pension for all disabled veterans not entitled to compensation under present law and regulations as embodied in your proposed measure known as H. R. 9687. Any other legislative measure this Congress may adopt will only constitute piecemeal legislation. A comparatively small number of veterans will be benefited by the measure passed by the Senate Monday, which also constitutes a discrimination against a vast number of overseas veterans who make up our membership. Legislation not based on the pension theory is piecemeal in effect, exorbitant in cost for the comparative good accomplished, and offers

no definite policy for the future. A World War service pension for disabled veterans is the only logical solution of existing difficulties, and this organization has unanimously expressed its stand in this regard during its past three national encampments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE], who will open the discussion of the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the majority of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, I am gratified by the vindication of its judgment that has just been given to it by four-fifths of the Republican Members of this House. [Applause.]

I am also gratified that the desires of the American Legion, as officially expressed to us, are going to be met by the legislation that will be enacted. The Legion, through its national commander and its spokesmen here, has from the start told us of its desire for certain legislation. In reviewing the various forms the measure has taken, the commander has repeated that wish. The granting of it was within the four corners of the bill as reported by the committee, as it passed the House, as it was reported from the Finance Committee of the Senate, as it passed the Senate, and it is within the four corners of this new bill. The commander says that anything beyond this would be the responsibility of Congress. We have taken that responsibility, going beyond the Legion program; but, remember, we are giving the Legion what it officially asked.

State organizations of the Legion and local organizations, misinformed, misunderstanding the situation, have requested Members of the House to do certain things, and in some cases, I think, have in response received commitments that have now proved embarrassing. Were it not for them I am sure that all the Republican Members of this House would stand behind the unanswerable arguments of the President of this country. [Applause.]

It was not through choice that any Republican member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation invoked partisanship. Through the early years of its existence Republicans and Democrats on the committee forgot their party differences, worked in harmony, reconciled honest differences of judgment as best they could. With this Congress the atmosphere changed. The minority Members began acting and voting as a unit. There soon appeared ground for the belief that they were deliberately seeking to put their party in the position of being the friend of the soldier. The partisan appeal was spread through one side of the House itself. When the committee bill came on the floor, and had by preposterous amendments been swollen to ridiculous proportions, every Democrat but one voted against making its enactment finally possible through a motion to recommit, and all Democrats but two voted for its passage. To-day 136 Democrats have just voted to overthrow the President's veto, and only 3 have given him approval.

Sir, ours is a government of parties. Through very much of our work no partisan controversy arises, but once in a while there comes a great question of policy, or a great question of principle, which brings back to us the recollection that we Republicans were intrusted with the Government of this country during the time of our service and that to us the country looks for responsibility. The leader of the Democratic Party here has thrown down the gage of battle. I take it up. [Applause.] The Republicans will go before the country this fall and tell them that we refused to deceive them; we refused to give them a falsehood; we refused to be led away to false gods but stood for truth and honor and fair play. If we are then not vindicated at the polls, we shall at least have the consolation of our consciences in that we have made it the Republican policy to deal fairly with all the soldiers, to make no discrimination, to give no unjust preferences, but to treat all of each class alike, extending equitably the bounty of the Government, the generosity of the Government, the pledge of faith of the Government to all those who made the sacrifice of service in the war. [Applause.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in the beginning I wish to say that I have looked up the RECORD with reference to the colloquy between myself and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS] and I find I was in error. He was right. He voted to override the veto of the Spanish-American War pension bill, and in justice to him I make this correction.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I ask the gentleman not to take up my time.

Mr. SIMMONS. The stenographic report shows the gentleman as stating that I have been against veterans' relief.



Mr. RANKIN. I told the gentleman I would correct that error.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a telegram just received from the Disabled American Veterans of the World War in session in New Orleans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by inserting a telegram. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The telegram referred to follows:

NEW ORLEANS, June 26, 1930.

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

#### Resolutions

"Whereas it is true veterans' relief legislation as sponsored by the President will actually include more men for service connection for service disability than the Rankin bill, but

"Whereas there are not less than 50,000 totally disabled men suffering with disabilities comprehended in the Rankin bill, and

"Whereas these totally disabled men are objects of charity and they and their families are dependent on the communities in which they reside, and

"Whereas a large percentage of the cases comprehended in the legislation indorsed by the President are able to earn a livelihood, and

"Whereas the same legislation would not actually care for the more severely disabled men: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the delegates of Tenth National Convention of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War assembled in New Orleans, La., go on record as indorsing the Rankin bill and that telegraphic communications be addressed to the Hon. NICHOLAS LONGWORTH, Speaker of the House of Representatives; Hon. JACK GARNER, House minority leader; and Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN urging them to exert every possible effort to secure final passage of the Rankin bill."

Unanimously adopted by the Tenth Annual Convention, Disabled American Veterans of the World War.

WILLIAM J. MURPHY, National Commander.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, you asked me if I was opposed to this bill. My answer was that I am opposed to it, but I am going to ask my colleagues to vote that it may go through the House and go to the Senate, in order that it may be there amended to give relief to our uncompensated disabled veterans of the World War, which this bill does not do.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, to address my remarks to section 200, and especially to that pauper provision in the bill, which applies to tubercular and neuropsychiatric cases, those unfortunate men who have broken down since the war closed as a result of their strenuous services in the World War. I call your attention to the fact that under this denatured Johnson bill you not only deny to them the full provisions of compensation, but you require them to plead their poverty and then, in order that there may be no doubt about it, make just enough allowance for them to keep them paupers and cause them to live a pauper's life.

To those tubercular men who came out of the service with affected lungs or with a slight cough, those patriotic American soldiers who fought the battles on and on and tried to keep from asking for relief until after 1925—by your votes to-day you have shut the door of hope in their faces and said to them, "You can either die or take the pauper provisions of this bill," which would allow those, with a 50 per cent disability, the small compensation of \$18 a month.

To the man who enlisted and went through the stress and strain of the training camp, who went through the mud and mire and hell of the battle front, who went over the top in the face of withering gunfire, inhaling poison gas—you said to him by your vote a while ago, "We will turn you out with a small pittance of \$18 a month, and make you prove your poverty in order to get that." This was on the roll call that you had to sustain the veto in order that you might bring this monstrosity before the House.

You say by your vote, to the man who has paralysis, the man who has rheumatism, the man with cancer, "You are not only going to have to prove your poverty before you can get a nickel, but we are going to see that you are kept in poverty by allowing you the small pittance of not more than \$18 a month, and then only so long as you can prove such disability."

Listen. I want to see the names of the men who cast such votes a while ago and who voted for the emergency officers' retirement bill a few years ago, to give a colonel with a 30 per cent disability \$281 a month; to give those men \$3,000 or \$4,000 a year, some of whom, as I showed in the RECORD of April 10, are drawing salaries up to \$10,000, some of whom, I showed, have as large law practices or as large medical practices as members of their professions in the United States—

I want to see the names of the men who voted a while ago to condemn these tubercular men, these men with cancer, these poor, unfortunate men with nervous trouble, to living deaths on the small pittance provided by the pauper provision of this Johnson bill, that none of you has ever read and none of you has one idea what is in it—I want to see your names in the RECORD along with your votes on these two measures.

We are going to send this bill to the Senate, and when it comes back here it is going to be amended, and these iniquitous provisions are going to be stricken out. We are going to take care of these tubercular men and men suffering from other chronic diseases if we have to keep you here all summer. [Applause.]

The telegram to which I have referred is from the Disabled Veterans of the World War, which represents the men who are really disabled, coming from every nook and corner of the United States. They appeal to you for relief. Yet to-day, by a vote of 188 to 182, you turn these men down under a promise that you would bring in some kind of an innocuous, denatured veterans' relief bill, which you have now done, and which you now propose to pass under suspension of the rules. Under section 200 of the bill just vetoed we would have taken care of these men who are now suffering from tuberculosis, and whose children are invariably dependent upon charity; by your vote you have denied them enough to live decently, when the American people in every State in this Union have appealed to you to lay aside your politics, to lay aside your prejudice, to lay aside your reverence for the "big stick," and vote to give these unfortunate men a reasonable measure of compensation in order that they may live decently and in order that their wives and children may be properly cared for.

I regret I have not time to analyze this bill, but we have not even had time to read it. It is a different bill from the one you handed to us when you started this debate a few moments ago.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. I notice this bill does not include any pension for widows and children of deceased World War veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, no. This bill goes back and takes up the provisions of the old Johnson bill, which you repudiated by your vote here, 324 to 49, before the Secretary of the Treasury told you "where to head in." [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I will certainly yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. As the gentleman has stated, we have had no opportunity to analyze the provisions of this bill, but we have been furnished with what purports to be an analysis of the bill. It is not signed, and I assume it has not been acted upon or considered by the committee. Does the gentleman know who prepared this analysis of the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. I never heard of it before, I will say to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. I am the ranking Democrat on this committee and I did not know there was such a document.

If it had not been for the fight we Democrats have made, you would not have had any veterans' relief legislation at all. One Member told me just before I took the floor that if it had not been for my efforts in this fight and the efforts of those associated with me these unfortunate men would not have received any measure of relief for possibly 15 years.

It is true they will get very little relief under this bill which you are now forcing through under suspension of the rules. You deny us any opportunity to change or amend it. You are afraid that we will inject a little humanity into it and give these poor, unfortunate veterans some measure of assistance.

Your action in bringing this bill in here and forcing it through in this manner, without giving us any opportunity to amend it, is one of the most outrageous abuses of legislative prerogatives ever indulged in by the party in power in the history of the American Congress.

We shall not oppose it. We expect to let it go through in order that when it gets over to the Senate, where the gag rules do not apply, they will amend it by inserting provisions which will take care of these unfortunate men who served their country in times of war and are now unable to defend themselves in times of peace. [Applause.]

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have five legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on this legislation.



Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—  
Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The gentleman has just secured that permission for himself, without any objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, no; I just reserved the remainder of my time and asked for permission to extend the remarks I made on the bill. I have no objection to those who speak on the bill extending their remarks, but they are going to have to do so much "remarking" on this bill when they go home, Mr. Speaker, that I do not think we ought to grant this request. Besides, the votes speak for themselves, and that is all the boys will want to see. Therefore I object.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman from South Dakota yield for a question? I assume this statement, which I hold in my hand, and which is called an analysis of the bill, was prepared by some one in authority?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I think it is accurate.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman inform us who prepared this analysis?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Several people contributed to its preparation. Parts of it were prepared by the committee on the original bill at the time the bill passed the House on April 24.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In effect, then, this was prepared by the Veterans' Committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. It was prepared by the Veterans' Committee, by the chairman of the Veterans' Committee, with the assistance of the bureau and with assistance from many sources, and it is accurate.

I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA].

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, the opportunity presents itself to-day to every Member of the House to do one of two things—either play practical politics and do something for himself, or else to lay politics aside and do something constructive for the benefit of the disabled veterans of his district. Again, the opportunity presents itself to either send to the veterans of your districts a political speech in a franked envelope, or else to send the veterans of your district a Government check in a Veterans Bureau envelope. [Applause.]

There seems to be confusion not only as to what is in the bill but as to existing law and what has been done for the veteran, as well as what it is intended to do for the veteran. For the purposes of compensation, compensatory and pension laws, veterans must necessarily be divided into two classes: First, the veteran who has been disabled by reason of his military service, and, second, the veterans who having rendered military service have become disabled subsequent to such service but not as a result of their military service. This classification is necessary in order that the Government may properly meet its obligations. It is not made or even referred to in any sense of belittling or disparaging the veterans who fall under the second classification. A veteran might not have been overseas or in actual combat, and yet his disability may be the direct result of his military service—what is known in the language of the veteran and the Veterans' Bureau as service connection. He is entitled to full compensation now provided in the law. A veteran might have been overseas and in actual combat, yet not injured and discharged with no disabilities and may have become disabled by disease or accident since his discharge from military service. He would fall into the second classification, and inasmuch as he could not establish service connection would be cared for in accordance with the bill now before the House under a pension system.

The Government owes a binding obligation to compensate the veteran who has become disabled by reason of his military service, and is doing so at this very moment. Our Government has established a custom of expressing gratitude to the veteran who was willing to incur the risk of war but was not disabled and who has become disabled since his discharge from the service, though not as a result of his military service. The bill before you now provides for this class of veterans who are disabled, but not through service connection. To the one the Government is under binding obligation; to the other the Government willingly and cheerfully expresses in a material way its appreciation.

We are concerned to-day with the veterans who have become disabled since their discharge from the military service but not disabled by reason of their service. This must be kept constantly in mind. The veteran who through service connection has been disabled may receive to-day, if he is permanently disabled, \$100 a month, hospitalization, allowance for dependents, and, in cases where an attendant is required, an allowance for such attendant. Every case cited by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], for whom I have a great deal of affection, is a case of service-connection disability. Such cases are amply provided for under existing law. For instance, he describes the boy who was discharged from the Army coughing from tuberculosis. Clearly that is a service-connected case,

and such a veteran would receive full compensation of \$100 a month and allowance for dependents. Mr. RANKIN refers to the boy who went over the top and who subsequently had become shell shocked. That is a clear case of service connection, and he would receive full compensation under the law. I know that there are many border-line cases, and in all cases where there is a doubt it is the duty of Congress that the doubt should be decided in favor of the veteran. [Applause.]

We do more than that in this bill. Let me read something which seemingly has been overlooked by the critics of the bill, a provision which will take care of every border-line case where there is a doubt as to service connection. The gentlemen will find the proviso at the bottom of page 2:

*Provided, That regulations relating to the nature and extent of the proofs and evidence shall provide that due regard shall be given to lay and other evidence not of a medical nature.*

Every Member on the floor to-day who has had experience with veterans' cases—and everyone has—will readily see that this will give the veterans the opportunity of submitting evidence outside of medical evidence, the only evidence admitted to-day, to prove his service connection, and everyone knows that that will greatly and materially facilitate the veterans in establishing service connection and coming under the provisions of existing law.

I have heard a great deal of talk among Members as to tubercular veterans. Tubercular veterans are fully provided for under existing law and in the bill now before the House. I will read the section:

*That any ex-service man shown to have a tuberculous disease of compensable degree, and who has been hospitalized for a period of one year, and who, in the judgment of the director, will not reach a condition of arrest by further hospitalization, and whose discharge from hospitalization will not be prejudicial to the beneficiary or his family, and who is not, in the judgment of the director, feasible for training, shall, upon his request, be discharged from hospitalization and rated as temporarily totally disabled, said rating to continue for the period of three years: *Provided, however, That nothing in this subdivision shall deny the beneficiary the right, upon presentation of satisfactory evidence, to be adjudged to be permanently and totally disabled.**

With the opportunity of submitting lay and other evidence, many of the veterans who had influenza in the service, who had a cold in the service, who were submitted to constant exposure, and who are now afflicted with tuberculosis, will be able to establish a service connection and obtain full compensation. If a tubercular veteran is a case where clearly the disease was contracted since his discharge he would be totally permanently disabled and would come under the provisions of the bill now before us and be retired with full pension.

Let me also point out that disposing of all of these cases as provided in the bill, once the veteran is on the pension roll and is not subjected to any further examinations, the bureau will then be free to devote more time and give better attention to all the new cases applying for compensation.

Comparison has been made by critics of the bill as to the rate of pension allowed in this bill with the rates recently allowed the veterans of the Spanish War. But bear in mind, gentlemen, that there is an average difference of 25 years of age between the veterans of the World War and the veterans of the war with Spain. The 25 per cent disability is a far greater handicap to a man of 55 years or 60 years of age than it is to a man of 25 or 30 years of age. [Applause.] Besides, also bear in mind that the Spanish War veteran waited a great many more years before obtaining his first pension bill. It was far less than the provisions and the rates contained in the present bill. If, after 12 years, the World War veterans will have obtained a pension law with the rates contained in the present bill, 25 years from now they will be far ahead in the way of rates of pension than their brothers of the Spanish War are to-day.

For every veteran who has been disabled by reason of his military service full and complete compensation under the existing law will continue; for every veteran who now does not receive one cent of compensation by reason that his disability is not of service connection will, if this bill is passed, be permanently placed on the pension roll. Considering the parliamentary situation—honestly considering all of the facts—I am convinced that the veterans of the World War, when they understand this bill, will be satisfied. All disabilities of nonservice connection should be considered if we consider one of them. That is exactly what this bill does.

I believe that I understand the attitude of the ex-service man; my knowledge of his hardship has not been obtained from a book. I have stood by the ex-service man on every proposition that came before the House. No one can charge me with being influenced by the demand of regularity. I vote according to my convictions. That being so, I call upon every ex-service man



of the House, the entire membership of the House, to vote for this bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY].

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen, in two minutes I can not go into this subject at any great length. I intend to vote for this bill with the expectation, almost knowledge, that when it goes over to another body the amendment of Senator WALSH of Massachusetts to bring the present rates in this bill up to the Spanish War veterans' law rates undoubtedly will pass the Senate; also, a provision will be put in the bill which will take care of the dependent widows and children.

Then I admit it will be a good bill, and if my vote and voice can help, I shall do everything in my power to keep Congress in session, if necessary, not only all this summer but all next winter until we pass veterans' legislation that is fair and just to the disabled men of the United States. We have had the usual prophecy from the Secretary of the Treasury of a deficit in the Treasury, which prophecy is always imparted to us every time that veterans' legislation comes before the House. These dire prophecies never are put out except when there is a possibility that the veterans are to obtain something, but in spite of the prognostications of Mr. Mellon, I have no doubt that whatever bill the House and Senate pass, whether it provides for \$100,000,000 or \$400,000,000, we will find that after July 1 we will have a surplus in the Treasury of perhaps two or three hundred million dollars, as we have had in the past eight years. I always take with a grain of salt these deficit predictions, especially since Mr. Mellon made his billion-dollar mistake in reference to the service men's adjusted compensation bill.

Therefore, in the hope and expectation that that great deliberative body at the other end of the Capitol will add proper amendments to this bill, which we under suspension of the rules are not permitted to add to-day, and will thereby make this a good bill for the service men and their dependents, it is my intention to vote for the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALMON].

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for this bill, not because I think it is good legislation, for I regard it as bad legislation, but because it is this or nothing. If we are going to turn to pensioning the World War veterans, I am in favor of giving them the same amount of pension for the same degree of disability that we give to the Spanish-American War veterans. [Applause.] I would offer an amendment to make them the same—if I could—but no amendment can be offered. I have just about come to the conclusion since this veterans' bill has been vetoed and the veto upheld that we ought to abolish the Veterans' Bureau and place them all in the hands of the Pension Office. I believe the Bureau of Pensions would more nearly do justice to all the World War veterans than the United States Veterans' Bureau. On yesterday the House passed the best World War veterans' bill—that is, the Rankin bill—that Congress has ever passed. To-day it was vetoed by President Hoover. Immediately afterwards the veto was sustained by votes of Republican Members who on yesterday voted for it. A bill of this importance should not be considered under suspension of the rules, but should be considered in the regular way, so amendments could be offered. I sincerely hope that the Senate will improve this bill with amendments so that it will do justice to the World War veterans who have been so neglected and mistreated by the Veterans' Bureau. [Applause.]

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, due to technicalities, thousands upon thousands of deserving veterans have been for 10 long years deprived of compensation which Congress originally intended they should have. Notwithstanding the severe criticism by the President of the bill that he has vetoed, I am of the opinion that it was not as vicious a bill as he charges. Otherwise it never could have obtained the unanimous vote of this House. But even if the House did make a mistake in voting for that bill we have accomplished one thing. We have brought about a condition whereby we are assured of some positive legislation in the pending bill, which very few Members know anything about. I was fortunate in securing a copy a short time ago, examined it hastily, and I shall vote for it, because I believe that when it reaches the other body that body will succeed in amending it in a way so that it will contain provisions that will give fair compensation not only to the deserving veterans but also to their widows and children.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I have confidence in the Senate and feel when the bill is returned to us it will be a much better bill and therefore ask and advise that we vote for it.

The veterans in whom we are interested are entitled to relief. I am glad that finally we have forced the hand of those who opposed any and all legislation and that we will be able to vote for a bill that will bring a deserved relief to the 10-year-neglected men, their widows and children.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I do not look with alarm on the often-repeated statement on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Mellon, about the shortage in the Treasury.

If only one-half of the Wall Street gamblers will pay the income tax from the tremendous gains they have made in selling short, we will have a surplus going into millions. It is unfortunate that Mr. Mellon is always so alarmed about the conditions of the Treasury when we aim or try to vote a pension and compensation to our veterans; such is not the case when he orders or grants refunds going into hundreds of millions to the steel and other trusts, or when he advocates the reduction of taxes of the excessively rich corporations and the multimillionaires that own and control them.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, my views on the question of a pension bill for veterans of the World War, their widows and dependents, were stated by me when the original Johnson bill was under consideration in the House. At that time I came out flatly and absolutely in favor of a pension plan. At that time the House leaders could not see their way clear to support such a proposition. In view of the fact that they were unable to support such a bill at that time, I supported the bill which passed the House and which was sent over to the Senate for consideration.

The debates in the Senate show that when the bill as it passed the House was in the Senate Committee on Finance for consideration a pension plan was proposed by Senator DAVID I. WALSH, of Massachusetts, an outstanding friend of the veteran, and that it was considered favorably by the members of the Senate committee. The debates strongly indicate that a pension plan as proposed by Senator WALSH was tentatively reported out of committee. The debates further show that some influences were exerted to prevent the reporting of a pension plan at that time, which influences were sufficient to prevent a pension bill being reported out of the Finance Committee. After the bill which was reported out of the committee was passed by the Senate and came back into the House, and apparently as a result of statements made by the President, General Hines, Director of the Veterans' Bureau, and Secretary Mellon, of the Treasury, the administration changed their minds and decided to support a pension bill. It is a well-known fact that when the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee of the House first reported the Johnson bill into the House, and a suggestion of a pension bill in lieu thereof was made by me, it was stated that a pension bill would not pass for many years to come. I could not agree with that position at that time, and I am glad to see that the principle of a pension plan that I then suggested is incorporated into the pending bill.

When the original Johnson bill was pending before the House I urged its passage because under the rules of the House an amendment proposing a pension scheme could not be made. I stated, however, that I felt that a fair and equitable bill, providing pensions for veterans of the World War and a widow and minor children of a deceased veteran, would be the best and fairest plan, establishing a definite policy which would not require any change except that in later years the benefits thereunder would be increased as veterans grew older.

During my remarks on that occasion I also stated that the present rights of the disabled service-connected veteran should not be disturbed, and that he, if he so desired, should be able to elect whether he would continue to receive compensation for service-connected injuries, or the pension that his disabilities would entitle him to under a pension law. This right of election would have enabled a veteran who is service-connected for certain disabilities, but who is not service-connected for other disabilities, the total of which disabilities would entitle him to a larger pension than he is receiving as compensation, to elect to take the larger amount. In other words, a man might be 15 per cent service-connected for disability, and he might have other disabilities which are not service-connected that would make him permanently disabled within the meaning of a pension law. Unless he had the right of election, he would be compelled to take \$15 or \$18 per month as compensation, whereas under this bill he would be entitled to at least \$40 per month, and more if his condition is such as to require constant care and attention.

While I favor the principle contained in this bill, I am not in agreement with some of its provisions. Unfortunately, under the rules under which we are considering this bill, amendments



can not be offered. We have got to either accept or reject the bill in its entirety. Believing in the principle incorporated in this bill, and feeling that it is the best that can be obtained, so far as the House is concerned, I am constrained to vote for its passage, with the hope that the Senate will make amendments that the World War veteran, his widow, and minor children are entitled to. If the rules under which we are considering the bill would permit of my offering an amendment. I would move that the minimum pension allowed for a 10 per cent disability be \$20 per month, and that the maximum amount be \$60 per month, with a provision for higher pensions in the case of men who require care and attention. I am in hopes that such an amendment will be offered in the Senate. Such a proposal was suggested by Senator WALSH in the Senate Committee on Finance, and I sincerely trust that the able and distinguished Senator, who is the leader of my party in my Commonwealth, and whom I unreservedly recognize as the leader of my party, will offer the same amendment and that it will be adopted in the other branch.

I also exceedingly regret that the present bill does not give consideration to the widow and minor children of a deceased veteran, whose death is not connected with the service. Under the existing law, a veteran who receives the great call, and who leaves behind him a widow and minor children, or other dependents, and whose death is the result of wounds, injuries, or disease which are service-connected, the widow is entitled to receive a certain sum each month, which is called "death compensation."

My experience, and I am sure the experience of other Members of this body, has been that only in a small percentage of cases of veterans who die are the deaths connected up with the service. This means the widows and minor children of all other deceased World War veterans receive no consideration from the Federal Government.

I am absolutely in accord with the principle of the pension legislation relating to the veterans of the Civil and Spanish-American wars, that upon their death their widows and minor children should receive pension consideration. If the principle is correct in its application to the widows and children of deceased veterans of all other wars, it is equally correct to apply it to the widows and minor children of deceased veterans of the World War. Already thousands of World War veterans have died, and during the last three years such deaths have averaged 43,000 yearly. Of those who have died, leaving a widow and minor children, or other dependents, the deaths of only a small percentage are connected with service. Assuredly, a widow and minor children of a deceased veteran of the World War is or are just as much entitled to a pension now as similar dependents of deceased veterans of other wars. I am in hopes that the Senate will, in its wisdom, see fit to adopt an amendment providing a pension for such a worthy and deserving class.

I also note under the terms of the present bill that a disabled service-connected veteran will not lose his present legal rights and that if, under the pension bill as pending, if it becomes law, his pension will be greater than the amount he now receives as compensation, he can elect to take the greater amount.

Mr. GRANFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. I certainly will yield to my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. GRANFIELD. I have listened to the remarks of my distinguished friend and colleague, and I want to say that I am absolutely in accord with the views expressed by him, and also by my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY], who spoke along the same lines a few moments ago. It is my intention to vote for this bill, in the hope that the Senate will adopt an amendment which will increase the pensions that veterans will receive to the amount which Spanish War veterans now receive, and particularly that the Senate will adopt an amendment providing for a pension for a widow and minor children of a deceased World War veteran, a class that so richly deserves and needs it.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. I want to thank my friend, Mr. GRANFIELD, for the able contribution which he has just made. I also want to state to him that his district ought to be proud of its representation. This is the first opportunity I have had on the floor of Congress to congratulate his district on the excellent judgment they exercised in selecting such an outstanding character and a man of such keen intellect and unlimited courage to represent them.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, I have in mind the action of the Congress in passing the recent Spanish War pension bill increasing the amount that they received prior to June 2, 1930. I consider it very unfortunate that the Spanish War veterans did not receive years ago the consideration which the recent bill

gives them. The fact that they did not receive at a time when they should have the consideration of a grateful country, and as outlined in a recent bill which was passed over the President's veto, is no reason why the World War veterans should start in at the rates of pension prescribed in the pending bill.

If I had an opportunity to offer an amendment, not only would I attempt to have one adopted that would take care of a widow and minor children of a deceased veteran, but I would offer an amendment which would give to the disabled veteran of the World War the same rights that veterans of the Spanish-American War enjoy under the recent law. Such a plan, with the reservation as provided for the disabled service-connected veteran to elect whether he will continue to accept compensation under existing law, or to come under whatever pension bill we may pass, if it becomes law, would be a piece of legislation that would be more satisfactory than the present one and, in my opinion, would meet with the approval of the American people.

I shall vote for the passage of this bill with the hope and expectation that the Senate will amend it so that greater benefits will be given to the veterans who will come within the purview of such a law, and give to the widow and minor children of a deceased veteran pension consideration. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, when the bill vetoed by the President is thoroughly understood by the veterans there will be no dissatisfaction. Since the bill passed the Senate I have carefully examined my files, cases where the bureau has denied compensation, and find that about 1 in every 5 would have been taken care of under the bill as sent to the President. Although all five might be suffering and be equally disabled still one suffering from a disease covered by the presumptive clause would be recognized while the other four whose disease was not covered would receive no compensation.

I was opposed to the original bill as reported to the House and also to the Rankin bill because both took care of a class of veterans leaving the great majority uncared for. Therefore when the measure was before the House I offered an amendment which placed all disabled veterans on a parity. My amendment carried and was in the bill when it reached the Senate but was deleted with other important amendments by the Finance Committee.

I stated when the bill was pending in the House, the bill would never solve the question, and that in my opinion a liberal pension bill, something along the line of the law governing Spanish War cases, would ultimately be, and should be enacted. I introduced the first World War pension bill in this Congress, June 29, 1929. February 8, 1930, the so-called Swick bill was introduced, and I have since supported that bill, it being more liberal than mine.

I might say I have talked with the Washington representatives of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and they are in favor of the pension system. I also talked with representatives of the American Legion, and they too stated my view was right, that a pension would be far more satisfactory as it would mean equal treatment for all, but they were bound by their national convention and would support the amendments to the veterans' law.

I do not think any Member of Congress handles more veterans' cases than I do. I average no less than 20 a day, handle them personally and have been doing this for years. Naturally, I should know something about the law as well as administration of the law.

As soon as the bill passed the Senate I spent hours looking into its features and examining cases of my constituents not now compensated, who seek relief. The bill extends the presumptive class of the act of 1924 to January 1, 1930, in place of January 1, 1925. Only certain diseases are included in the presumptive class. My amendment to the bill placed all in the presumptive class, my viewpoint being to treat all veterans alike. That amendment being eliminated, I find only one out of every five veterans whose case I have, would be recognized.

The bill contained so many equalities without my amendment I could not conscientiously favor it when there is an opportunity to get a law that will extend equal treatment to every veteran who is disabled.

As an example of what would have happened under the bill vetoed, take five veterans living in the same neighborhood in my district. One gets compensation, the other four would be denied compensation. One veteran would be satisfied, four would be dissatisfied.

Below will be found a list of diseases from which veterans whose cases I have handled are suffering who would not be



recognized under the bill vetoed by the President: Bronchitis, asthma, bronchial asthma, in nearly every instance the men claiming to have been gassed in the service, but the bureau has not recognized their claim; diseases of the eye, even to total blindness, unless the total blindness was due to a misconduct disease contracted during the period of the man's service; defective hearing, even though the veteran be totally deaf; pleurisy, kidney disorders other than nephritis, various diseases of the stomach, fistula, hemorrhoids, hernia, varicocele, hydrocele, varicose veins, sinusitis and all sinus disturbances, defects of speech other than congenital; gastritis, pancreatitis; cystitis, a very common disease of the bladder; prostatitis, unless the disability is due to willful misconduct; diseases of the tonsils; phlebitis, a common disease of the leg; colitis, diarrhea, ordinary dysentery; enteritis, a very common disease of the stomach; only three of many heart disabilities are recognized; spondylitis and diseases of the spine; no dental disabilities are recognized, nor could any veteran receive dental treatment under the provisions of the bill who have no positive proof they were treated for the disability while in the service. Due to loss of dental records, thousands of men have been denied dental treatment by the Veterans' Bureau. There was no relief in this bill for them. Men diagnosed as constitutional psychopathic inferiority are denied recognition. In this class will be found tens of thousands of veterans, all of whom have never received compensation. Another outstanding injustice is where the veteran met with an accident and lost an arm or leg or both arms or both legs since his discharge. He is denied compensation, but under the presumptive clause his comrade who contracted rheumatism 10 years after his discharge would be entitled to compensation. Hundreds of other diseases could be listed as not being recognized, and in all it can not be assumed that as many as 25 per cent of the veterans now disabled and uncompensated would have been taken care of by the bill as it was sent to the President. They all would have been cared for under my amendment which was deleted from the bill in the Senate.

The bill failed miserably to take into consideration as previous legislation has failed to give presumption of service connection when a presumption might properly be accorded. Take the man who developed bronchial asthma shortly after his discharge, and I have one such case. He is almost totally disabled by reason of such condition. Because presumption was not accorded to this disease he will continue as he has for 10 years to be refused compensation. The bill recognized dietary disturbances, and if the man died from such a disease his widow would receive compensation even though death occurred 10 years after discharge, while the veteran leaving a widow and orphans who died a year after his discharge of an acute condition such as pneumonia remained uncared for. Yet the same judgment which would accord service connection for a certain heart disability which developed in 1929 could with the same force and wisdom say that pneumonia, which terminated fatally, was contributed to by the weakened resistance of active service during the World War. There are many cases of men who are gunshot casualties maimed on the field of battle who have died of pneumonia or some acute condition, and the Veterans' Bureau has been unable to say under the present law and would be unable to say under the bill sent to the President that their service-incurred wounds or diseases were contributing factors to the cause of death, and as a result their widows and orphans are uncared for.

This is particularly true of the shell-shocked cases where the veteran died of some acute condition. Who can say a veteran whose mind was weakened by service in the war and compensated therefor did not occasion the loss of physical resistance to throw off acute diseases? The bill, if it had become a law in the form it was sent to the President, would have occasioned a spirit of unrest and dissatisfaction among a large majority of veterans who were not recognized. This unrest would be reflected in future years after its passage, because all constitutional diseases arising after January 1, 1930, would have remained uncompensated.

I firmly believe, as I have always believed, that recognizing all disabilities not now compensable under the veterans' act on a disability pension basis and caring for widows and orphans not now compensable will produce in the minds of veterans that extreme satisfaction that the Government has not given preference to a few and has been mindful of its pledge to care for all in need as a reward for services when the Government was in need.

The pension bill which passed the House immediately following the veto is not as liberal as I would like to see it, but I am mindful of the established policy in cases of this kind, namely, that the authors have left room for improvement by the Senate, and I am sure that when it returns from the Senate it will be much more acceptable. Its cost to the Government will be over

\$50,000,000 the first year. It is a step in the right direction and can be liberalized from time to time. Every veteran who would have been taken care of under the bill vetoed will be cared for under the substitute. The compensation will not be as high but they will be cared for.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the Rankin bill for the relief of disabled veterans of the World War, which the President has vetoed, and which by prearranged agreement the Republicans of this House have just killed by sustaining said veto with a vote of 188 to 182, is the only relief bill that this House has ever had an opportunity to help frame. All other relief measures coming before this House since the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation was created, have been called up under a suspension of the rules, where only 20 minutes to the side was allowed for debate, and where none of the voluminous and important provisions could be changed in the slightest particular. These former bills thus passed have been machine made. They have been mostly prepared by hard-boiled bureau chiefs. Not even ranking members of the committee, much less any of the other 434 Members of the House, could change one word of the bills. This is the reason that technicalities have deprived thousands of totally disabled veterans of relief urgently needed and left them helpless with wives and children starving.

When this Rankin bill was passed by the House there were only 49 votes against it. If it had been a vicious, bad bill, would the Republican leaders of this House have allowed it to pass with only 49 votes against it, when the Republicans have a majority of over 100 Members in this House? If it were wasteful and extravagant, was it not the duty of the Republican leaders in this House, who now speak of their responsibility to the Nation, to have stopped its passage, and not given their approval to it, with only 49 votes against it, out of the total membership of 435 Representatives?

This Rankin bill thus went to another body. It was there carefully considered, first by a committee, and then by another body itself. Another body amended it, making its provisions even more favorable to disabled veterans. It was debated by it at length. Although Republican leaders of the House and administration spokesmen had had weeks to consider and ponder over the bill they had passed, none dared to take the floor and condemn it as vicious, or as extravagant, or as bad. They casually allowed adjournment to approach without a word of warning. They did not hold a Republican caucus. They did not hold a Republican conference. They did not swing their party lariat around the necks, or bulldog, or hog tie the rank and file, and place upon them the Hoover brand of subjection and obedience.

On last Monday, June 23, 1930, another body amended and passed this Rankin bill by a vote of 66 to 6, or 11 to 1. Out of 96 who had the privilege of being present and voting, only 6 personally voted against this bill. Does Mr. Hoover expect the country to believe that a vicious, bad, extravagant, ruinous bill could thus pass any body of the United States Congress, after being carefully considered for weeks and debated at length, with only six personally voting against it?

Then, on yesterday, June 25, 1930, this House, by unanimous vote, concurred in all of the Senate amendments, and this Rankin bill, thus finally passed, went to the White House for slaughter. But it went there well recommended. Only 49 Members had voted against it when it was passed by the House. Only six Members of another body had voted against it when it was amended and passed. And not a Member of the House had voted against concurring in the Senate amendments, but the bill was finally approved yesterday by the unanimous vote of the House.

And now it is dead. A Republican President vetoed it. And the Republicans of this House, under the command of their President, have slaughtered it.

There are three separate, distinct branches of government, Mr. Speaker. One is the Congress. It has upon it the burden and responsibility of passing our laws. The second is our courts. They have the burden and responsibility of interpreting the laws passed by Congress. The third is the Executive. The burden and responsibility is upon the President to execute and enforce the laws. None of the three has the right to invade or interfere with the functions of the others. They are separate and distinct. We can not shift our responsibility to the people by the attempted excuse that the President insisted on us doing so-and-so. Obeying the mandate of the President does not warrant our laying aside our own judgment and convictions.

The President is afraid that this Rankin bill will cost over a hundred million. He asserts that it is not in accord with his financial program. What if it should cost a hundred million. Had the World War been prolonged one month it would have



cost many times this sum. It was these brave men, the disabled whom we are now seeking to succor and rehabilitate, who forced the armistice months before the most sanguine hoped for it to occur. They thus saved hundreds of millions of dollars. And they thus saved thousands of precious lives, possibly prevented hundreds of thousands from being maimed.

This Republican President, Mr. Hoover, and his Republican followers in this House, without the quiver of an eyelash recently granted to special-interest-recipients of the tariff one thousand million of dollars in gratuities. That was within the President's financial program. That was within the financial program of the Republican Party. That comes out of the pockets of the common people in what they eat, wear, and use in their homes and on their farms. This Republican Party, through its Republican President and administration, has since the war granted to large taxpayers refunds of taxes admittedly amounting to \$1,191,000,000, of which \$96,000,000 went to the United States Steel Corporation. That was within the financial program of the Republican President. None of his party followers have objected or criticized, or condemned him for it. If the projects authorized by the rivers and harbors bill are appropriated for, that bill will eventually cost the taxpayers of the United States approximately \$250,000,000, yet we are told that it is within the financial program of the President, and that this Republican Executive will promptly sign it. No Republican caucus was held against it. No Republican conference consigned it to slaughter and death. Only when we send to the President a bill first passed by the House with only 49 votes against it, passed by another body with only 6 votes against it, and finally approved by the House with a unanimous vote, and which seeks to succor and rehabilitate helpless disabled ex-service men, does the President get scared, and becomes afraid that it might cost over a hundred million, and caucuses are called, and conferences are held, and Republicans do his bidding, killing the bill.

Now, by this rule just passed, we are again asked to pass a relief bill under suspensions of the rules, with only 20 minutes of debate to the side, and with the membership knowing nothing of its contents, and without their having time to analyze it and find out what it all means, and with no Member having the privilege of offering a single amendment to it.

I brought forth from the chairman of the Rules Committee [Mr. SNELL] that it can not be changed in any way, that we can not even dot an "i" or cross a "t" in it, but must vote for it just as it is, machine-made as usual, and assume that it helps the disabled. Of course, all of us will vote for it. We have no other alternative. It is the only promise of any relief this session for the disabled.

Another body will, of course, properly amend it. It does not function under such gag rules. But what is this House going to do with it after it is properly amended? If the President is consistent, he will veto it again. I am one who is willing to stay here until a proper measure is passed over his veto. We passed the Spanish-American pension bill over his veto when only 14 Members voted to sustain him. And a proper bill should be passed over his veto by just such an overwhelming majority.

When these men went to France I was one of those who promised them we would care for the ones who came back. I am going to keep my promise to them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAVAGAN].

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, as one of the youngest Members of the House, and a World War veteran, I feel I would be recreant of my trust and unfaithful to my oath were I to permit this occasion to pass without comment on the scenes enacted here to-day. I, as well as many other veterans, have utmost trust and belief in the conscientiousness of Mr. JOHNSON, the chairman of the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee of this House.

However, one grows very morose when he beholds the spectacle as beheld here to-day, of Members offering apologies for their vote in favor of the passage of the veterans' relief bill and their contradictory vote to sustain the President's veto. Then, too, the spectacle of the majority Members rising and applauding the result of that vote reminds one very forcefully of the scene enacted in war days, as regiments marched away—there on the street curbs, could be seen the corpulent and opulent cheering on the braver youth, with boisterous promises to hold for them their places of employment until the return. When the day of return came, alas, the jobs were filled.

Here, yesterday, this House passed the veterans' relief bill with great gusto, but when the veto vote was taken many of

these same gentlemen assumed contrary positions. When I hear the glib-tongued gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] attempt to explain the provisions of this new bill, H. R. 13176, I am reminded of the admonition of old "to beware of Greeks bearing gifts."

The pending bill is offered not from a sincere desire to aid and assist the World War veterans, but rather is an attempt to assuage his anger and ward off the day of reckoning at the polls. The proffered bill will not aid those veterans who are now suffering the results of war service and for whom Congress has failed to provide. The President in his veto message accompanying the World War veterans' relief bill, based his argument in the main on the basis of tremendous cost in carrying out the provisions of the bill. It is my contention that the bill now under discussion will prove a greater cost and burden in the final analysis than could the veterans' relief bill. The present bill is the basis for and is an out and out direct pension. Instead of the former bill, which took care of marginal cases, this new bill provides aid for every ex-service man whose disabilities were incurred in civil life and lays the foundation of a general pension system, which in time will prove a tremendous burden to the American people. In a very few years the experiences gained from the Civil and Spanish-American Wars pension systems will be realized through the pension provisions of this bill. I regret sincerely the failure of final passage in this House of the real disabled veterans' relief bill. While I intend to vote for the passage of this bill, I do so reluctantly and solely in apprehension lest this Congress pass no veterans' relief bill whatever.

At the outset of our entrance into the World War and ever since, the executive and legislative policy of our Government has been that soldiers of the World War would be protected; first, by insurance in case of death; and second, by compensation in case of injuries or disabilities incurred by reason of service. This policy of our Government is the antithesis of the policy proposed to be inaugurated by the provisions of this bill. No veteran or veterans' organization I have heard of has ever advocated the pension system for veterans of the World War. In fact, the New York department of the American Legion has advocated the beneficent provisions of the vetoed bill and opposed the contemplated pension provisions of the proposed one.

Under the parliamentary rule adopted this morning, no amendment of this proposed bill is possible from the floor of the House. Since one is unable to do aught but accept or reject the provisions of the bill I shall by my vote accept its provisions with a fervent hope that in the Senate the same may be suitably amended. In order, therefore, to give the Senate adequate time to consider and properly amend this bill, I shall by my vote, attempt to prevent the adjournment of the Congress until the passage of suitable World War veterans' legislation has been realized.

Ladies and gentlemen, responsibility for the passage or non-passage of legislation must be placed squarely on the shoulders of the party in domination of the legislative branch of this Government. Therefore, every World War veteran in dire need of aid may thank the Republican Party of this House for its failure to properly heed this plea for such aid and assistance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has three minutes, and the gentleman from South Dakota seven minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOUSER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for one minute.

Mr. MOUSER. Mr. Speaker, for the first time since the World War we have an opportunity this afternoon of establishing a pension system that will secure to every World War veteran suffering 25 per cent disability compensation at the hands of his Government, unhampered by red tape and technicalities.

These boys are now on an average 34 years of age. Eleven years after the World War we are getting a pension policy established such as took the Spanish-American War veterans 22 years to have established.

When the ex-service men throughout the country realize that every single disabled comrade of theirs can draw a pension, this legislation will be the most popular legislation that has been enacted into law. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that each Member may be allowed five legislative days in which to extend his remarks on this bill.



The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. CONNERY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I dislike to object ordinarily, but the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] objected, and therefore I will have to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LANKFORD].

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an editorial on the President's veto, by Mr. Louis Jaffee, the man who several years ago won the Pulitzer prize for the best editorial published in the United States that year, and editor of the Virginian-Pilot, one of the leading newspapers in Virginia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing an editorial on the President's veto. Is there objection?

Mr. CONNERY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, if it is remarks on the President's veto, I am forced to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HOPKINS].

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, there are 61 Members of Congress who are veterans of the World War. Forty-five of these are Republicans, 15 are Democrats, and 1 is a Farmer-Laborite.

It is very interesting to note how these Members voted to-day. Fifty-eight Members who are veterans were present. Thirty-six voted to sustain the President, and 22 voted to override the veto. Furthermore, I believe I can safely predict that 95 per cent of the veterans present to-day will vote for the passage of the bill now under consideration.

It has been a source of great satisfaction to me to note the very evident intent of the membership of the House to deal fairly with the disabled veterans of the World War. During all of this debate this afternoon no Member has objected to the "costs" of legislation. This is as it should be. The thing for us to decide here is what is the right thing to do—the fair and equitable thing to do—and not "how much does it cost."

The bill that we shall pass this afternoon will extend aid to more than 200,000 veterans, while the bill that has just been vetoed would have aided only 70,000.

I have spent more than 15 hours this week going over cases of uncompensated disabled veterans of my district. I have taken 50 typical cases that I have worked on to see how many would be benefited under each bill. These veterans whose cases I examined come from St. Joseph, Mo., Dearborn, Mo., Weston, Mo., Savannah, Mo., Tarkio, Mo., Rockport, Mo., Platte City, Mo., Corning, Mo., Maryville, Mo., Elmo, Mo., Skidmore, Mo., and several other towns of northwestern Missouri. Under the bill that the President vetoed less than 25 per cent were taken care of. Under the bill we are now discussing more than 90 per cent were taken care of.

This bill is the most liberal and most equitable one every passed by any government in the world for the benefit of disabled veterans.

Members should keep in mind that after this bill becomes a law any ex-service man who is disabled due to his service will receive compensation at the rate of \$100 per month for total disability. Furthermore, any ex-service man who is disabled not because of his service will receive \$40 per month for total disability.

Personally I think this latter rate should be higher, and I hope the Senate will see fit to amend this bill by increasing the rates and by providing a widow's pension for this latter class.

The bill that has just been vetoed would not have given compensation for the most serious and fatal heart diseases, stomach trouble, and so forth. The following diseases would not be considered as compensable:

Pericarditis, auricular fibrillation, cardiac enlargement, systolic murmur, thrombosis, embolism, phlebitis, varicosities, gastritis, colitis, enteroptosis, sprue, cirrhosis of liver, peritonitis, bronchitis, bronchiectasis, bronchial asthma, emphysema, pleurisy, pneumoconiosis, pyogenic infection of kidneys, diseases of the bladder, diseases of the testes, skin diseases, acute rheumatic fever, syphilis, bacillary dysentery, myalgia (muscular rheumatism), hookworm infestation, distomiasis, filariasis, trichiniasis, malaria, and many surgical conditions.

Think of the absurdity of paying a man \$225 a month pension for gout or rickets and giving nothing to a man with cardiac enlargement, systolic murmur, emphysema, a dangerous disabling chest condition, or pneumoconiosis, a hardening in spots of the lungs, which entirely incapacitates the individual who suffers from it.

Think of the absurdity of paying a man a pension for obesity and giving a man nothing for muscular rheumatism, which prevents him from moving from his bed.

The Rankin bill is a bill based upon a false premise and a falsehood. The bill under consideration is based upon the premise that every man who is disabled will be treated exactly like every other man similarly disabled. Do not forget that when this bill passes, your service men will secure equal treatment and just treatment. Do not forget that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA], who is one man who left the floor of this House and entered a combat unit and who has done more in war and knows more about war than most people here, called attention to the fact that in the future the Director of the Veterans' Bureau can consider lay testimony. He is not bound by what some doctor who is now dead has said about it. It will service connect many cases of tuberculosis, where there is a shadow of proof that it is service connected.

Mr. Speaker, when I addressed the House earlier this afternoon I predicted that this bill would receive 95 per cent of the veterans' votes. I want to call attention to the fact that of the 70 veterans present, 98 per cent voted for the bill.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIROVICH].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, a great philosopher, scholar, and sage once remarked that all the world loves a lover. If all the world loves a lover, I would like to paraphrase that sentiment by saying that all the world loves a fighter, particularly if he is fighting for an ideal, for a principle, for justice, or for liberty.

To-day I have seen an exemplification of the finest type of political patriotism that I have ever witnessed in this historic structure. JOHN RANKIN, from Mississippi, the senior member of the Veterans' Committee on our side of the House, battling for the cause of the American soldier, while down home in Tupelo, Miss., his distinguished father, Thomas Rankin, died last night. Broken-hearted and overwhelmed with emotion at the loss of his sainted father, we, nevertheless, find this JOHN RANKIN, militant Member from Mississippi, standing here battling courageously, fearlessly, and uncompromisingly, trying to bring justice to the American soldier. [Applause.]

Gentlemen on the Republican side of the House, let me remind you, when war was declared we never told our volunteers and conscripted soldiers that there would be two kinds of soldiers, those who fought in the trenches and ditches and those who were accidentally in the cantonments waiting to be sent to the field of action. To my mind, the soldier in the cantonment awaiting transportation for overseas duty is just as great a patriot as the soldier in the trenches. [Applause.] Any man wearing the uniform of an American soldier, marching away under our American flag, ready to do or die for our cause and our country, is entitled, when disabled, to all the protection that a grateful Republic can bestow on its valorous sons. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, ladies, and gentlemen of the House, the time has now come where actions speak louder than words. The American soldier is not looking for sympathy; he demands justice in his great hour of need. Let me read you two telegrams I have just received:

NEW YORK, N. Y.

HON. WILLIAM I. SIROVICH,

Washington, D. C.:

American Legion of New York State and its auxiliary most strongly urge passage of Johnson-Rankin bill as passed by Senate without amendments and without conference. One hundred thousand disabled veterans asking help, which they sorely need. Surely you will not fail them now by changing Senate bill so as to increase cost, and thus jeopardize signature by President. Request also your influence keep Congress in session to pass bill over President's veto, if necessary. Would appreciate wire assuring your support of above requests.

JOHN J. BENNETT, Jr.,

Commander New York Department, American Legion,

305 Hall of Records, New York City.

SUNMOUNT, N. Y.

The Hon. WILLIAM SIROVICH,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Tubercular World War veterans resent implication their disability not service origin. Please refute on floor House statement bureau medical council impossibility our disability service origin. Such arbitrary rulings prove impossible for us to surmount under present law.



Urge your continued support extension presumptive clause despite presidential objection. Your attention invited editorial New York American June 25 supporting Rankin bill.

JAMES J. FOLEY,  
Commander D. A. V.

Mr. Speaker, I am battling for 18,000 tubercular veterans, who I believe would not be taken care of under this bill unless they proved themselves permanently disabled.

In the name of those who have died for our Republic and have made the supreme sacrifice upon the altar of national patriotism and love of country, I appeal in the name of these hallowed dead for justice for their disabled and crippled brethren, to live in happiness, in concord, and contentment as peaceful citizens of a grateful Republic. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS. I am extremely glad that the veterans are going to be on a permanent and fixed basis of allowance. Those men will now know they will have a certain amount of money regularly instead of wondering whether their compensation may be reduced every few months. I am thankful that playing politics with human suffering is now about to end. [Applause.]

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KVALE].

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, if any Member of the House will turn to page 15 of this bill and will examine carefully the provision that is the heart of the measure, he will find this new provision applies to those who are permanently disabled and not to those who are temporarily disabled. It only applies to those who have a permanent disability as defined by the director.

If that Member will then return to his office and look at his files and find the proportion of claims in which disabilities are rated permanent, he will quickly see that he will have to go back to his district and tell his veterans suffering from many mental disorders, pleural disorders, nervous disorders, rheumatic disorders, that they are temporarily disabled within the meaning of the act as interpreted by the director and as such do not even rate the \$12 or \$18 they would get if this bill becomes law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I add the following: I had only one minute of time. I could only indicate, in a fragmentary way, my objections to this bill. Had debate not been so rigidly restricted, and had there been ample opportunity for expression of objections, I am convinced results would have been different. Here are some of the things I had wanted to say.

I want the RECORD to show that had Members been aware of the scope and provisions of this measure they might indeed have voted differently. And certainly they are not to blame, when even members of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation told me, after the chairman had made the motion to suspend the rules, that they knew nothing of committee action or of the contents of this measure. Those who did know would answer no questions from their colleagues. The spectacle of Members frantically scurrying to secure copies of this measure, after it was already under consideration, was one that was not at all pleasant to behold in this legislative body.

Members who have claimed during the debate that this measure will take care of all non-service-connected disabled might well scrutinize the bill more closely. The bill provides that no veteran who has less than a 25 per cent disability can receive any allowance. It provides further that no man who has less than a 50 per cent disability can receive more than \$12 per month. The bill provides further that no man who has less than a 75 per cent disability can receive more than \$18 per month. And so forth. Far less, in dollars, than we recently gave the Spanish War veterans by an overwhelming vote.

That is not the worst. The bill specifically states that no man who is not considered permanently disabled—as opposed to temporarily disabled—can be considered in this connection at all. In determining whether a disability is permanent or temporary in connection, the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau is the judge.

Any Member of Congress—and there is not one that has not done valiant work in endeavoring to secure satisfactory and favorable adjudication of these veterans' claims—can testify to the fact that is further shown in the hearings held before the Veterans' Committee this winter, namely, that of the million claims, in round numbers, which have been disallowed in the Veterans' Bureau, we find the greater number are designated in the bureau's diagnoses as temporary disabilities. They know further that of the quarter-million claims, in round numbers,

that has been allowed, only a small portion are called permanent.

Members know further that the director, and those who are with him responsible for determining upon policies of the Veterans' Bureau, have been unnecessarily harsh in designating disabilities to be temporary in nature, when, as a matter of fact, every consideration would seem to warrant their rating as permanent.

The Pension Office has been more generous in these matters. This bill calls for the regulations under which the Veterans' Bureau operates, and not the Pension Office practices. For that reason I oppose it.

This legislation was brought in under suspension of rules, in violation of every decent form of legislative procedure, without adequate consideration, under unwarranted and improper Executive pressure. It has been supported reluctantly by the membership of this House in the hope that another legislative body might so amend it that it would be less distasteful to the Members who have voted "yea" this afternoon.

I can not interpret my oath of office to mean that I should support a measure in which I have no faith, which I know to be of illegitimate origin, in the vain hope that I may evade responsibility by supposing that another body of Congress will correct the evils in the bill which has been before us.

One thing more. And I add it with full knowledge that it will be considered distasteful by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], to whom it refers.

But I want to express my personal gratitude, as a Member of Congress, as a veteran, as an American Legionnaire, as a Veteran of Foreign Wars, as a personal representative of a great number of veterans, and as his friend, to JOHN RANKIN.

To-day his father lies dead. He was so notified yesterday. To-day he had the choice of remaining here to try to convince this Membership of its responsibility, or of leaving to reach his home in time to be present at his father's burial. He deliberately chose the former. I shall not forget that fact; nor will the veterans of the Nation forget it.

Nor will we forget that, but for his alert and active interest, all this veterans' legislation would not have been considered at this session. Which inescapably leads to the observation that the first consideration in his bill and in legislation heretofore considered, that of proper attention to those veterans suffering from the chronic or constitutional diseases, not now compensated for, is in this measure entirely ignored. I hope the Senate will change it most drastically; but I know that in the meantime the responsibility rests on the administration leaders in this House; it must be faced; and I shall not help them evade it.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota who just addressed you is honest, but he has entirely misrepresented the status of section 200. There has never been a time in the history of the United States, in the Spanish-American pension bill or any other, when veterans were not required to be rated as permanently disabled. Otherwise a man suffering from scarlet fever or pneumonia or tonsillitis would receive a pension. The rules and regulations adopted by the Pension Bureau will be the rules and regulations adopted under the provisions of this act.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. And is it not a fact that after he has recovered from scarlet fever or pneumonia he would still continue to draw a pension?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. He would if he once went on the roll.

Now, I have listened to as much demagoguery on veterans' legislation as any living human being. I have heard it before the committee and I have listened to it on the floor of the House for 12 years. There are more people who saw less fighting who can wade in more blood on the floor of this House than any soldier who was ever at the front. [Applause.] Personally I am getting tired of the politics of it. It is absurd and ridiculous that honest Democrats should disagree with honest Republicans on what ought to be done. There never was any politics in the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation when the membership of that committee was composed of soldiers like Bulwinkle, of North Carolina; MILLIGAN, of Missouri; BROWNING, of Tennessee; JEFFERS, of Alabama—men who served and fought and who were wounded [applause]—and CONNERY, of Massachusetts, color sergeant of the One hundred and first Infantry. [Applause.] Sometimes we disagreed, but we did not play politics. Right now is the time in the history of our country when we should stop playing politics and get back to the basis on which we originally started this legislation. [Applause.] The Rankin bill would not have done what the gentleman thought it would do. It would take care of men who had some of the following diseases: Acidosis, pellagra, scurvy, gout, hemophilia, that could only be inherited from the



mother; rickets, obesity, and a lot of diseases of that kind. It would not have affected some of the other diseases.

I am going to ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to extend my remarks in the Record to show exactly what both of these bills would have done.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The Rankin bill would not have taken care of men suffering from the most serious and fatal heart diseases, stomach trouble, and other diseases.

The following diseases, pericarditis, auricular fibrillation, cardiac enlargement, systolic murmur, thrombosis, embolism, phlebitis, varicosities, gastritis, colitis, enteroptosis, sprue, cirrhosis of liver, peritonitis, bronchitis, bronchiectasis, bronchial asthma, emphysema, pleurisy, pneumoconiosis, pyogenic infection of kidneys, diseases of the bladder, diseases of the testes, skin diseases, acute rheumatic fever, syphilis, bacillary dysentery, myalgia (muscular rheumatism), hookworm infestation, distomiasis, filariasis, trichiniasis, malaria, and many surgical conditions, are general medical conditions which would not be included in a group confined to constitutional diseases and diseases analogous to constitutional diseases.

Think of the absurdity of paying a man \$225 a month pension for gout or rickets, and giving nothing to a man with cardiac enlargement, systolic murmur, emphysema, a dangerous disabling chest condition, or pneumoconiosis, a hardening in spots of the lungs which entirely incapacitates the individual who suffers from it.

Think of the absurdity of paying a man a pension for obesity and giving a man nothing for muscular rheumatism which prevents him from moving from his bed.

The Rankin bill is a bill based upon a false premise and a falsehood. The bill under consideration is based upon the premise that every man who is disabled will be treated exactly like every other man similarly disabled. Do not forget that when this bill passes, your service men will secure equal treatment and just treatment. Do not forget that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia], who is one man who left the floor of this House and entered a combat unit and who has done more in war and knows more about war than most people here, called attention to the fact that in the future the Director of the Veterans' Bureau can consider lay testimony. He is not bound by what some doctor who is now dead has said about it. It will service-connect many cases of tuberculosis, where there is a shadow of proof that it is service connected. Those that never should be service connected will get their \$40 a month and their hospitalization, which is a total pension of \$160 as long as they live.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Dakota to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 365, nays 4, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—365

Abernethy	Browne	Cooper, Ohio	Edwards
Ackerman	Browning	Cooper, Tenn.	Elliott
Adkins	Brumm	Cox	Ellis
Allen	Brunner	Coyle	Englebright
Allgood	Buckbee	Craddock	Eslick
Almon	Burdick	Cramton	Estep
Andresen	Busby	Crisp	Esterly
Andrew	Butler	Cross	Evans, Calif.
Arentz	Cable	Crosser	Evans, Mont.
Arnold	Campbell, Iowa	Crowther	Fenn
Aswell	Campbell, Pa.	Culkin	Fisher
Auf der Heide	Canfield	Cullen	Fitzgerald
Ayres	Cannon	Dallinger	Fitzpatrick
Bacharach	Carley	Darrow	Fort
Bachmann	Carter, Calif.	Davenport	Foss
Bacon	Carter, Wyo.	Davis	Frear
Baird	Cartwright	Dempsey	Freeman
Bankhead	Celler	Denison	French
Barbour	Chalmers	DeRouen	Fulmer
Beedy	Chase	Dickinson	Gambrell
Beers	Chindblom	Dickstein	Garber, Okla.
Bell	Christgau	Dominick	Garber, Va.
Black	Christopherson	Doughton	Garrett
Blackburn	Clague	Douglas, Ariz.	Gasque
Bland	Clancy	Douglass, Mass.	Gavagan
Blanton	Clark, Md.	Doutrich	Gibson
Bolton	Clark, N. C.	Dowell	Gifford
Bowman	Clarke, N. Y.	Doxey	Glover
Box	Cochran, Mo.	Drane	Goldsbrough
Boylan	Cochran, Pa.	Drewry	Goodwin
Brand, Ga.	Cole	Driver	Graham
Brand, Ohio	Collins	Dunbar	Granfield
Briggs	Colton	Dyer	Green
Brigham	Connery	Eaton, Colo.	Greenwood
Britten	Connolly	Eaton, N. J.	Gregory

Griffin	Korell	Oldfield	Sproul, Ill.
Guyer	Kurtz	Oliver, Ala.	Stafford
Hadley	LaGuardia	Oliver, N. Y.	Stevenson
Hale	Lambertson	Palmer	Stobbs
Hall, Ill.	Lampert	Palmsano	Stone
Hall, Ind.	Lankford, Ga.	Parker	Strong, Kans.
Hall, Miss.	Lankford, Va.	Parks	Strong, Pa.
Hall, N. Dak.	Larsen	Patman	Sullivan, Pa.
Halsey	Lea	Patterson	Summers, Wash.
Hammer	Leavitt	Perkins	Swanson
Hancock	Leech	Pittenger	Swick
Hardy	Lehlbach	Pou	Swing
Hare	Letts	Prall	Taber
Hartley	Lindsay	Pratt, Harcourt J.	Tarver
Hastings	Linthicum	Pratt, Ruth	Taylor, Tenn.
Haugen	Lozier	Pritchard	Temple
Hawley	Luce	Purnell	Thatcher
Hess	Ludlow	Quayle	Thompson
Hickey	McClintic, Okla.	Quin	Thurston
Hill, Ala.	McClintock, Ohio	Ragon	Tilson
Hill, Wash.	McCormack, Mass.	Rainey, Henry T.	Timberlake
Hoch	McCormick, Ill.	Ramey, Frank M.	Tinkham
Hoffman	McDuffie	Ramsayer	Treadway
Hogg	McFadden	Ramspeck	Tucker
Holaday	McKeown	Rankin	Turpin
Hooper	McLaughlin	Ransley	Underwood
Hope	McLeod	Rayburn	Vestal
Hopkins	McMillan	Reed, N. Y.	Vincent, Mich.
Houston, Del.	McSwain	Reid, Ill.	Vinson, Ga.
Howard	Maas	Robinson	Wainwright
Huddleston	Magrady	Rogers	Warren
Hudson	Manlove	Rowbottom	Wason
Hull, Morton D.	Mapes	Rutherford	Watres
Hull, William E.	Martin	Sabath	Watson
Hull, Wis.	Mead	Sanders, N. Y.	Welch, Calif.
Irwin	Menges	Sanders, Tex.	White
Jeffers	Merritt	Sandlin	Whitehead
Jenkins	Michener	Schafer, Wis.	Whitley
Johnson, Ind.	Miller	Schneider	Whittington
Johnson, Nebr.	Montague	Sears	Wigglesworth
Johnson, Okla.	Mooney	Seiberling	Williamson
Johnson, S. Dak.	Moore, Ky.	Selvig	Wilson
Johnson, Wash.	Moore, Ohio	Shaffer, Va.	Wolfenden
Jonas, N. C.	Moore, Va.	Short, Mo.	Wolverton, N. J.
Jones, Tex.	Morehead	Shott, W. Va.	Wolverton, W. Va.
Kahn	Morgan	Shreve	Wood
Kearns	Mouser	Simmons	Woodruff
Kelly	Nelson, Me.	Simms	Woodrum
Kendall, Ky.	Nelson, Mo.	Sirovich	Wright
Kennedy	Newhall	Sloan	Wurzbach
Kerr	Niedringhaus	Smith, Idaho	Wyant
Ketcham	Nolan	Smith, W. Va.	Yates
Kieess	Norton	Snell	Yon
Kincheloe	O'Connell	Snow	Zihlman
Kinzer	O'Connor, La.	Somers, N. Y.	
Knutson	O'Connor, Okla.	Sparks	
Kopp	O'Connor, N. Y.	Speaks	

NAYS—4

Johnson, Tex. Kvale Lanham Milligan

NOT VOTING—59

Aldrich	Finley	Kiefner	Sinclair
Beck	Fish	Kunz	Spearing
Bloom	Free	Langley	Sproul, Kans.
Bohn	Fuller	McReynolds	Stalker
Buchanan	Garner	Mansfield	Stegall
Burtess	Golder	Michaelson	Stedman
Byrns	Hudspeth	Montet	Sullivan, N. Y.
Collier	Hull, Tenn.	Murphy	Summers, Tex.
Cooke	Igoe	Nelson, Wis.	Taylor, Colo.
Cooper, Wis.	James	Owen	Underhill
Corning	Johnson, Ill.	Peavey	Walker
Crail	Johnston, Mo.	Porter	Welsh, Pa.
Curry	Kading	Reece	Williams
De Priest	Kemp	Romjue	Wingo
Doyle	Kendall, Pa.	Seger	

So two-thirds having voted in favor thereof the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Golder with Mr. Byrns.  
 Mr. Fish with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.  
 Mrs. Langley with Mr. Kemp.  
 Mr. Sinclair with Mrs. Owen.  
 Mr. Bohn with Mr. Stedman.  
 Mr. Welsh of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hull of Tennessee.  
 Mr. Seger with Mr. Collier.  
 Mr. Free with Mr. Spearing.  
 Mr. Aldrich with Mr. Stegall.  
 Mr. Crail with Mr. Sullivan of New York.  
 Mr. Underhill with Mr. Mansfield.  
 Mr. Reece with Mr. Romjue.  
 Mr. Beck with Mr. Bloom.  
 Mr. Cooper of Wisconsin with Mr. Corning.  
 Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Hudspeth.  
 Mr. Kiefner with Mr. Fuller.  
 Mr. Sproul of Kansas with Mr. Montet.  
 Mr. Kendall of Pennsylvania with Mr. Buchanan.  
 Mr. Murphy with Mr. Wingo.  
 Mr. Nelson of Wisconsin with Mr. Doyle.  
 Mr. Johnston of Missouri with Mr. Williams.  
 Mr. Finley with Mr. McReynolds.  
 Mr. Cooke with Mr. Kunz.  
 Mr. James with Mr. Igoe.  
 Mr. Curry with Mr. Garner.  
 Mr. Johnson of Illinois with Mr. Sumners of Texas.

Mr. MOUSER. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to announce that the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. REECE, is unable to be present, being unavoidably detained at his home in Tennessee, but if he were present he would have voted "yea."



Mr. CRAIL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the RECORD show that if I had gotten here in time I would have voted "yea."

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, Mr. KADING and Mr. PEAVEY, are unavoidably absent. Were they here they would vote "yea."

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues from Tennessee, Representatives BYRNS, HULL, and McREYNOLDS, are unavoidably absent. I am authorized to state that if they were present they would vote "yea."

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. COOPER, wishes me to have him recorded as being in favor of this bill, although he is not here.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I have a telegram from my colleague from New York, Mr. FISH, stating that had he been able to be present he would have voted "yea."

Mr. KENDALL of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. WALKER, is unavoidably absent. If he were here, he would vote "yea."

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. KIEFNER, is unable to be present. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote, but can not qualify. If permitted to do so, I would vote "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS—WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago a request was made that all Members be allowed to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill that has just passed, but objection was made to that request. It is evident that a great number of Members will wish to extend their remarks in the RECORD and will be asking for that privilege from time to time. In order to save time and the confusion which usually follows when a number of Members are asking to extend their remarks, I again make the request that all Members of the House may have until the end of the session leave to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of veterans' legislation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that all Members may have until the close of the session to extend their own remarks on this bill. Is there objection?

Mr. CONNERY. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman reserve his objection a moment?

Mr. CONNERY. I will reserve it.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that when the gentleman from Connecticut made this request the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] was in the room, and if he had desired to make an objection he could have done so. I do not think the gentleman from Massachusetts has any obligation now to make this objection.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I will reserve the right to object, and if the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is present—

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The gentleman just stepped out of the door. I saw him.

Mr. CONNERY. If the gentleman is outside the door, I will be forced to object.

Mr. TILSON. When I rose to speak the gentleman from Mississippi was standing over here.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. And was standing right there when I rose.

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman from Mississippi is in the Speaker's lobby now.

Mr. CONNERY. I understand that if the gentleman from Mississippi were present he would object. I object for the present.

Mr. TILSON. I think that I could appeal to the reason of the gentleman from Mississippi if he were present. We are not saving any time by refusing, and we should prevent confusion in the transaction of business from now until the end of the session by granting leave for all to extend their remarks, and for that reason I renew the request.

Mr. CONNERY. I object.

Mr. MICHENER subsequently said: Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members be given until the end of the session to extend their own remarks on veteran legislation that passed the House yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that all Members may have until the end of the session to extend their remarks on veteran legislation. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object. I think the request ought to be put in this form: That all Members of the House be permitted until the end of

the session to make explanation of their votes on the veterans' bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. MICHENER. I have no objection if the gentleman from Texas wants to explain. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I voted against H. R. 13174, amending the World War veterans' act, which passed the House yesterday, because of the rash, inconsiderate, and revolutionary method by which the bill was considered, and also because of its inadequate relief provisions and gross discrimination against World War veterans.

The most flagrant violation of all rules safeguarding and insuring intelligent consideration of legislation was committed in the passage of this bill. Never was a more wanton and reckless disregard of orderly procedure or such undue and precipitate haste manifested by any legislative body in considering legislation of major importance.

The bill was introduced less than an hour before it was voted upon in the House. It was referred to no committee, as required by the rules. It was considered by no committee, and the membership of the House, including the members of the Committee on World War Legislation were not permitted to see it until its consideration was begun in the House.

Immediately after its introduction it was called up to be voted upon under suspension of the rules, whereby entire debate was limited to only 40 minutes, and no amendment of any kind could be considered or even offered.

It was a voluminous bill, covering 35 printed pages, changing in many particulars existing law governing the relief of World War veterans. It was impossible, during the brief debate of 40 minutes, which was divided between a number of speakers whose time limit ranged from one to five minutes—mostly one to two minutes—to learn from the speakers very much concerning the bill. In fact, a majority of them had never read it. It was likewise impossible, in this brief time, to read, much less analyze and comprehend, this lengthy and involved bill and to know its consequences and effect upon disabled veterans.

The cause of the disabled veterans of the World War is one in which I am deeply interested. I have supported all legislation in their behalf, and have given much of my time in looking after the individual claims of those in my district, and have appeared and orally argued many of them in the Veterans' Bureau here in Washington and also in the regional office.

I could not give my consent to vote for a bill the effect of which was unknown to me, especially when, from a superficial examination, I discovered that it was inadequate in the relief afforded; that it meant that many of those veterans now suffering from disabilities incurred in the World War would receive no relief, and that some of those now receiving compensation would, by the terms of the bill, receive less if the bill passed.

Specifically pointing out some of its objectionable features, if I correctly interpret the last paragraph in section 14, it means that those veterans having arrested tuberculosis disability who, under the present law, receive \$50 per month will be reduced to \$25 per month.

The executive branch of the Government has for some time been threatening to secure a repeal of the statute allowing \$50 per month for this disability, and while Congress would not consent thereto, it appears that a joker in this bill has accomplished that result.

Realizing that this bill deprives disabled veterans of the benefits conferred upon them in H. R. 10831, passed at this session of Congress and vetoed by the President just a few minutes before the passage of the bill under consideration, and in an attempt to atone therefor this bill inaugurates a pension system. The veterans of the World War and especially the American Legion have at all times manifested their opposition to pensions and insisted that they prefer adequate compensation for those whose disabilities were incurred in service.

However, if the time has arrived, and in order to do justice to the veterans of the World War it is necessary to grant pensions to those whose disabilities are not service connected, then I insist that there should be some measure of adequacy in the pensions granted, and the law should not so limit and restrict the right to receive same that it would be almost impossible to secure favorable action; and, furthermore, the veterans receiving such pensions should not be discriminated against.

In the provisions of the bill granting pensions to World War veterans whose disability is not service connected there is a gross discrimination against World War veterans as compared with the veterans of other wars in three particulars: (a) As to rates of pensions so granted; (b) as to degree of disability entitling to such pensions; and (c) financial condition of veterans entitled thereto.



First. As to the rates of pensions granted therein to World War veterans, I quote from the bill:

Twenty-five per cent permanent disability, \$12 per month; 50 per cent permanent disability, \$18 per month; 75 per cent permanent disability, \$24 per month; total permanent disability, \$40 per month.

Contrasting these rates with those granted to the veterans of the Civil War and the Spanish-American War are as follows:

All Civil War veterans who served in the Union Army for 90 days or more, regardless of the question of disability or financial condition of the veterans, receive \$75 per month, or \$100 per month where the condition of the Civil War veteran, by reason of disabilities, is such as to require the aid and regular attendance of another person.

The widows of Civil War veterans, under existing law, receive \$40 per month.

Comparing the pensions granted Spanish-American War veterans under existing law and World War veterans under this bill, I quote below the comparative rates:

Spanish-American War veterans		Per month
One-tenth disability	-----	\$20
One-fourth disability	-----	25
One-half disability	-----	35
Three-fourths disability	-----	50
Total disability	-----	60
World War veterans		
One-tenth disability	-----	Nothing.
One-fourth disability	-----	per month—\$12
One-half disability	-----	do—18
Three-fourths disability	-----	do—24
Total disability	-----	do—40

Regardless of disability, Spanish-American War veterans also receive pensions based upon attained age, as follows: 62 years, \$30 per month; 68 years, \$40 per month; 72 years, \$50 per month; 75 years, \$60 per month.

The widows of Spanish-American War veterans receive \$30 per month. The widows of World War veterans under the bill receive nothing.

#### DEGREE OF DISABILITY

Second. The discrimination against World War veterans under the bill is not confined to the rates, but also to the degree of disability necessary to be shown to entitle them to a pension.

Under the law Civil War veterans are required to show no disability of any character to entitle them to a pension, and Spanish-American War veterans are only required to show an existing disability, while under this bill World War veterans will be required to show the existence of a "permanent disability."

No pension legislation heretofore has been so onerous as this. Those of us who have had experience with the Veterans' Bureau in their interpretation of the term "permanent disability" know that it is almost impossible, unless the veteran has lost an arm, a limb, or an eye, to convince them that the disability from which he is suffering is permanent in its nature. If the Veterans' Bureau continues to interpret "permanent disability" under this law as they have under World War relief legislation, it will mean a denial of a pension in practically all cases with the exceptions above mentioned.

#### POVERTY OF VETERANS

Third. Before a World War veteran is entitled to receive a pension under this bill he is required to show that he was exempt from the payment of a Federal income tax for the year preceding the filing of application for pension, and the bill further requires that there must be obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury a certificate to the effect that the veteran so applying for a pension was entitled to exemption from the payment of a Federal income tax for the year preceding the filing of his application.

Civil War veterans and Spanish-American War veterans under the law receive pensions regardless of their financial condition. A veteran of these two wars may be a millionaire, and yet under the law he is entitled to a pension, while a World War veteran must show his poverty before he is entitled thereto. And this proof must be submitted not only by himself but corroborated by a certificate from the Secretary of the Treasury.

The foregoing are some of the defects I detected in a necessarily hasty examination of the bill.

In striking contrast with the scant consideration given this bill was that devoted to H. R. 10831, which passed the House and Senate at this session, full consideration thereof having been given by the committees of both Houses, and unlimited debate being allowed when it was considered in both bodies.

But the President disapproved of it, among other reasons because he said its cost would be \$110,000,000 the first year, although the hearings on the bill before the Senate disclosed that the amount would be only \$74,000,000.

Secretary of the Treasury Mellon also gave out an interview that it might cause a deficit in the Treasury, but he made this

same prediction when, in 1924, we passed the World War adjusted compensation act, and instead of a deficit there was a very large balance.

It is strikingly strange that this administration always preaches economy when veterans' relief legislation is considered. Refunds to large corporations, aggregating nearly a billion dollars, shipping contracts that cost the Government millions of dollars for carrying an infinitesimally small amount of mail, huge frauds in post-office rental contracts in Milwaukee and other cities do not excite the attention of the administration, but let the subject of veterans' relief legislation be considered, and the cry of economy is always raised.

The President also gave out a statement to the effect that H. R. 10831 was not desired by the American Legion.

I know not what the American Legion in other places may have desired, but in Texas H. R. 10831 as it passed the Senate was indorsed by the Legion. On June 13, 1930, I had a telegram from Hon. Ernest C. Cox, department commander of the American Legion of the State of Texas, urging that the bill as amended by the Senate be accepted by the House without amendment. To the same effect was a telegram to me of June 23, 1930, from Mr. Robert O. Whiteaker, department adjutant, American Legion of the State of Texas, and also a letter of June 17, 1930, from Mrs. Helen Beale Dean, chairman legislative committee, American Legion Auxiliary of Texas.

I voted to pass H. R. 10831 over the President's veto, as I did his veto of the Spanish-American bill, but the House refused to do so by a vote of 182 to 188.

The Republican leaders in the House manipulated the immediate consideration of this bill, following the President's veto, not so much for the relief of the veterans but for the relief of the President and those who voted to sustain his veto.

It is my judgment that a majority of those in the House voting for H. R. 13174 did so with the hope that the Senate would properly consider the bill, amend it, liberalize its provisions, and remove its discriminations. This I hope they will do.

I shall vote against adjournment of the Congress for this session until after just and adequate relief legislation is passed in behalf of the disabled veterans of the World War.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the new veterans' bill which passed the House Thursday after the President had vetoed a veterans' bill which had passed the House unanimously and the Senate by a vote of 11 to 1, is a subterfuge and will mislead the veterans of the World War. They are led to believe by proponents of this measure that they are being treated fairly. In the language of Mr. LUCE, of Massachusetts, as it appears on page 11833, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 26, 1930:

If we are then not vindicated at the polls, we shall at least have the consolation of our consciences in that we have made it the Republican policy to deal fairly with all the soldiers to make no discrimination, to give no unjust preferences, but to treat all of each class alike extending equitably the bounty of the Government—

And so forth.

#### MELLON'S IDEA OF JUSTICE

After reading these remarks I am willing to leave it to you to say whether or not the Republican policy is to deal fairly with all the soldiers. I believe you will be convinced that the policy adopted is for the purpose of establishing war-time rank as a basis of compensation for disability in time of peace, and to deal niggardly with enlisted men and generously with a few commissioned officers.

The President was persuaded to veto the bill because it was claimed a deficit would be caused by its enactment.

In the American Magazine for July, 1930, there is an article entitled "Andrew Mellon Stripped of His Mystery," by Will Irwin. Doubtless this article was written by Mr. Irwin after obtaining the information for it either from Mr. Mellon personally, as many of the instances recited in the article indicate, or from one of his close associates and with the knowledge and approval of Mr. Mellon. This article discloses the following facts:

When Andrew Mellon entered the Treasury he was active director in 300 companies—coal, steel and iron, oil, aluminum, paint, shipbuilding, real estate—these are the major items.

#### MELLON THE SHIPBUILDER

About shipbuilding and the organization of a big company to make ships the following is quoted:

He had named it the New York Ship Building Corporation. What that company did between 1914 and 1917 is a part of war history. At the peak, Mellon sold it out to one of the companies, whose brokers had descended on him in 1914. When he became Secretary of the Treasury the newspapers announced, perhaps with truth, that he was the third richest man in the United States. He had come to the



mature age of 66, immensely rich, tremendously respected by his associates, a quiet unadvertised power in Pennsylvania Republican politics.

Only two other men in the whole United States richer than he was in 1920. I wonder if anyone is richer than he is to-day?

#### MELLON NOMINATES HOOVER

Speaking about the candidates for President in 1928, it is said—

He arrived at Kansas City two days before the nomination. The Hoover landslide was on. Supporters of the other candidates met him at the station, hurried him to a conference in a hotel room. If Mr. Mellon would name any candidate but Hoover and throw the Pennsylvania vote his way, they would unite to support him. "But, gentlemen, I have already said that I favored Hoover," replied Mellon mildly. "Wasn't my language plain?" From that moment only death could have stopped Herbert Hoover from the nomination.

From the foregoing it will be seen that Mr. Mellon was doubtless responsible for the nomination of Herbert Hoover. Therefore Mr. Hoover is under obligation to Mr. Mellon to keep him in the Cabinet as long as he cares to stay, as suggested in the magazine article.

#### NO VETERAN RELIEF FROM MELLON

The World War veterans will never get a square deal as long as Andrew Mellon is Secretary of the Treasury. Every time a bill comes before Congress for the purpose of aiding veterans, Mr. Mellon immediately commences to show that the enactment of the bill will cause a deficit in the United States Treasury.

This bill that passed the House Thursday should be labeled "The Mellon bill."

#### A FALSE PROMISE HELPED TO CARRY TEXAS FOR HOOVER

During the presidential campaign of 1928 in Texas the Hoover forces of that State and the anti-Smith forces of that State advised the voters of Texas that if Herbert Hoover should be elected President, Andrew W. Mellon would not be Secretary of the Treasury, neither would he hold any other position in Herbert Hoover's Cabinet. Evidently these statements were made for the purpose of getting votes. The people of Texas knew that Mr. Mellon was not a prohibitionist, that he has been an enemy to the cause, and that he is an enemy to the cause of the poor, plain man or woman who depends upon his daily labor for the support of himself and family. And in order to carry that great State this false statement was made.

#### THE MELLON PRIVATE FORTUNE

Mr. Mellon's private fortune, which was enhanced so greatly during the war and by reason of the country's misery and misfortune, has become so large that a request for an appropriation from the United States Treasury is a personal matter with him. He looks upon it as an attempt to cause him to pay more money in taxes. Mr. Mellon's salary as an official of the United States Government is \$15,000 a year. His income from his large estate, enhanced by war profits, doubtless exceeds \$30,000,000 a year. Therefore this official who stands in the way of all soldiers' relief is making \$50 a day to serve his country and \$100,000 a day to serve the special interests of the Nation. Who is he going to serve? A man can not have two masters.

#### ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATE COULD BE PAID

If he is such a great financier as some people would have you believe, why does he not propose to borrow money for 2 or 2½ per cent at this time and pay the soldiers the amount of their adjusted-compensation certificates or the amount that has accrued on the debt acknowledged by the Government to be due in 1918, with interest from that date at the rate of 6 per cent? Instead of that he opposes paying the adjusted-service certificates. The Government is making lots of money loaning the soldiers their own money at 6 per cent compounded annually when the Government can get all the money it wants for 2 or 2½ per cent interest. The payment of these certificates at this time would bring immediate prosperity.

#### DEFICIT TALK TO KILL VETERANS' RELIEF

When there was a proposal to give foreign nations billions of dollars there was no talk of a deficit. The railroads were financially sick after the war, it is claimed. Mr. Mellon did not ask them to wait, but was favorable to giving them billions of dollars out of the Treasury of the United States and the pockets of the people to relieve their financial distress.

April 30, 1930, Mr. Ogden Mills, the chief assistant to Mr. Mellon, told the United States Chamber of Commerce that another tax revision is coming, indicating a great reduction in taxes. It is well known that Mr. Mellon has in his vest pocket at this time a proposal to exempt foreign capital from taxation. This proposal will doubtless be presented at the December session of Congress, after the November election, and passed. It will reduce taxes, but never will Mellon say it will contribute to the cause of a deficit.

The rivers and harbors bill, which recently passed Congress, authorizes an appropriation of \$144,000,000. Neither the President nor Mr. Mellon screamed "deficit" when it was mentioned. Billions of dollars have been appropriated during this session of Congress without the mention of a deficit until soldiers' relief was suggested.

#### HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS FOR BEAUTIFICATION OF WASHINGTON

As a part of the magazine article mentioned above, there is a picture of a group of large Government buildings, under which is the following:

A part of official Washington as it will look when one of Andrew Mellon's finest dreams takes material form.

Please note one of Mellon's finest dreams. He is not thinking of disabled soldiers or people in distress. He is thinking of spending hundreds of millions of dollars for fine buildings. He is endeavoring to make his name immortal by spending millions of dollars to beautify Washington, when there are millions of people walking the streets of the United States to-day begging for the privilege of working in order that they may support themselves and families, and can not find a job of any kind. Very few jobs will be available to men outside of Washington on account of this program. Many of these men hold the Government's I. O. U. in the form of an adjusted-service certificate. They served their country in time of war and now the Government does not pay them the money that it has confessed is due. No mention of a deficit by Mr. Mellon when this great building program was being discussed and agreed upon.

#### SCANDAL OF HOOVER ADMINISTRATION

One of the scandals of the Hoover administration is ship-subsidy contracts. Hundreds of millions of dollars are being authorized to give shipping lines a subsidy. Many of these lines are making 25 per cent and 50 per cent on their investments. Notwithstanding this, the Government, through the Post Office Department, is giving these concerns mail contracts which will aggregate hundreds of millions of dollars. They give ocean-mail contractors several hundred thousand dollars a year to carry \$3 worth of mail. In other instances the Government is paying \$7,000 for one dollar's worth of service. A direct gift from the United States Treasury to the favored few and pampered pets of the administration. No talk of a deficit when all this was going on.

#### PLENTY TO BUY WINE AND SONG

The day before the first soldiers' bill, which was vetoed by the President, passed the House of Representatives, tens of thousands of dollars appropriation was authorized for social entertainment for our representatives in foreign countries. These representatives under this authorization will be permitted to use the taxpayers' money to buy wine and song and for any other purpose that they see fit, and charge it up to the social entertainment fund. No mention of a deficit when items like this were discussed.

#### BILLIONS FOR TAX REFUNDS

When the United States Steel Corporation, Aluminum Co. of America, Gulf Refining Co., and many other large trusts and monopolies of the Nation were paying large income taxes in 1917 and 1918, the people thought this money was paid in good faith and received in good faith. They were correct. But after Mr. Mellon became Secretary of the Treasury he has remitted to these concerns and others two or three billion dollars in what he claimed were excess collections. He is giving back to these concerns taxes they paid as far back as 1912 and 1913. United States Steel Corporation has gotten a refund of nearly \$100,000,000 through Mr. Mellon. One of the latest refunds, amounting to about \$30,000,000, was obtained by a former official of the Treasury Department, and he felt like his services were so useful to this large concern in persuading Mr. Mellon to treat it right that his fee for the work he did was set at \$5,000,000. In other words, as stated by Mr. GARNER, our minority leader, a few days ago, this concern had to pay this influential man \$5,000,000 to persuade Uncle Andy to give them a square deal.

TWO HUNDRED DOLLARS A MONTH FOR OFFICER, BUT \$12 A MONTH FOR PRIVATE

Congress has already passed a law which will give to officers who served during the World War and only during the World War for a 30 per cent permanent disability two or three hundred dollars a month, depending upon rank. Many of these officers are drawing this enormous compensation for diseases and injuries that were not in fact connected with the service. Yet Mr. LUCE says that the Republican Party is dealing fairly with the soldiers when he votes for a bill that will give an enlisted man who has a 49 per cent permanent disability the niggardly sum of \$12 a month. This is the Mellon idea of justice. Mr. Mellon is controlling the Republican Party, and as long as he occupies that position the Republicans will be compelled to sing



his praises and put their stamp of approval upon everything he suggests.

#### ASKED FOR BREAD BUT GIVEN A STONE

Hundreds of thousands of the veterans of the World War, men who at the beginning of the war walked up to Uncle Sam, signed on the dotted line, and offered to give their lives to the cause of their country, are now helpless, dying of injuries and diseases received during the war and contracted by reason of their military service. They are only asking for an annual expenditure of what will amount to the annual income of Mr. Mellon and one other man. This is denied them. They are asking for bread, but Mr. Mellon is handing them a stone. They served our country in time of need. Now the war profiteers are preventing them from getting justice. Not only are the veterans suffering but their wives and children are in distress.

#### BILLIONS FOR EVERYTHING EXCEPT VETERANS' RELIEF

Billions for railroads, billions for foreign countries, hundreds of millions for buildings, hundreds of millions for rivers and harbors, billions for war profiteers on tax refunds, hundreds of millions for ocean-mail contracts, tens of thousands for social entertainment, but a niggardly sum for veterans of the World War.

#### WHAT 1925 INCOME-TAX RATE WOULD DO

If Congress would restore the same income-tax rate that is now being paid by the income-tax payers of other leading countries of the world the increase that would be paid by the individuals whose annual incomes are in excess of a million dollars a year would be sufficient to amply take care of the soldiers and pay their adjusted-service certificates. I would not be in favor of taxing this class by itself, but I would spread it over all income-tax payments. These figures are given for the purpose of showing how easily the money could be raised by those who profited most by reason of the country's misery and misfortune during the recent World War. There are 24 people in the United States whose annual incomes are more than \$5,000,000 each. These individuals—most of them, at least—accumulated a greater portion of their fortunes from war contracts and settlements by the Government after the war.

#### WAR PROFITEERS SHOULD PAY

Justice should be done. The profits of war profiteers should be utilized to adequately compensate World War veterans. We can now equalize the burdens of the last war.

If Mr. Mellon could be persuaded to be just as anxious to do justice to veterans as he has always been to give refunds on taxes of large corporations, the veterans of the World War would have no cause to worry.

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, in the early part of this Congress, which is soon to adjourn, a careful study was begun and bills introduced to amend the World War veterans' act of 1924 so as to do absolute justice to every soldier who participated in that great conflict and who received injury or whose health was lost or impaired by reason of his service.

When we look back to the time before the beginning of this great World War and see these splendid young men in the bloom of young manhood facing the future with bright prospects and in perfect health and following the various vocations and avocations of life open to them, and then this great World War being thrust upon us, and the call of the Nation coming to these splendid men to lay down their business and if need be to sacrifice their lives in defense of their country, we see them willingly obeying this call and going to the training camps there to be trained and carried into the battle lines where many of them sacrificed their lives, others losing an arm or leg or suffering other great injuries and many of them losing their health on account of the service that they were required to render. Many of them are now in dire distress who have never received a penny's compensation for their injury and suffering.

This Congress should not adjourn until absolute justice is done them.

A bill was introduced, was given careful study by the committee and reported to this House, where it was amended and made into a bill which if enacted into law would have been doing absolute justice to every man who rendered honorable and faithful service.

This bill passed the House with only a few votes against it, and then went to the Senate and was there amended and returned to this House and without a dissenting vote the Senate's amendments were concurred in by the House, and this bill went to the President of the United States with practically the unanimous indorsement of both the Houses of Congress and should have, we think, received the indorsement of the President and made a law.

This bill was vetoed by the President and the responsibility for its failure must fall upon him and his party, which could

have enacted it into law regardless of his veto, if they would have done so by casting their vote to override the President's veto.

We are informed that a caucus was held by the Republican Party behind closed doors on the night before this veto was received by the House, and in said caucus they bound themselves not to override the veto of the President. If this caucus had not been held and it had been left open for every man to vote as he saw fit and as his conscience dictated, the result might have been different.

The holding of this caucus and agreeing not to override the President's veto before it had ever been made was certainly an encouragement to the President to veto the measure. By this act the Republican Members of Congress assumed the responsibility for the defeat of this legislation in the form that it was presented in the bill that every Member of Congress had carefully studied for months, and had been supported by a large majority of them.

On the day before this veto was returned to the House a unanimous vote of both Democrats and Republicans in the House was to concur in the Senate amendments and let the bill become a law as amended.

On the day following we saw a large percentage of the membership on the Republican side, when the President's veto was not overridden, standing on their feet and cheering lustily the President in vetoing a measure as a bad piece of legislation they had unanimously voted for the day before.

Now, let us see what is the next picture in this scene. You had a rule reported by the Rules Committee making it possible for the taking up for immediate consideration a new bill just introduced that the membership as a whole had never seen and had been given no opportunity to study, and which was to be passed in 40 minutes without allowing any amendments whatever to it. To refuse to pass it would be to deny any relief whatever to these suffering veterans, and this bill was passed with only 4 votes against it in the House and sent to the Senate, where they would have an opportunity of amending it and putting it in shape so it would do justice to these suffering men.

Under the provisions of this last bill passed a soldier suffering with as much as 49 per cent total disability is given the pitiable sum of \$12 per month. That is not my idea of justice, and it is not right to the man who made this great sacrifice for the peace and happiness and security of our Nation.

The responsibility for this class of legislation must fall upon the Republican Party, and is not the Democratic idea of justice and fairness to this great number of suffering humanity who has made the great sacrifice for the security of us all.

Many millionaires were made by excessive profits in the war, and they are rolling in wealth while the soldier languishes in misery and poverty.

When these boys were away and while they were fighting our battles we said in our hearts that if they were permitted to return nothing would be too good for them. Let us hope that the Senate will so amend this bill as to do absolute justice to this number of great men.

Mr. SANDERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note something about the history of the legislation in the behalf of the World War veterans. The House passed the Johnson bill by a very large vote, and when it reached the Senate certain amendments were placed on the bill by the Senate. When it came back to the House, the House, by a unanimous vote, accepted the Senate amendments. The bill then went to the President who vetoed it. Notwithstanding the fact that the bill containing the Senate amendments was unanimously passed by the House, according to newspaper reports, the Republicans went into caucus and pledged themselves to sustain a threatened veto by the President, which of course encouraged the President to veto the bill. The next day after this caucus the President sent in his veto message which was sustained by a vote of 182 to 188.

This was a just bill and should have become a law. The sentiment of this country is that ample provision should be made for the care of those who made the supreme sacrifice. Many of these ex-service men have died while the Congress has been haranguing about this legislation. Concerning the President's veto of this just measure in their behalf, it might be interesting to recall here an article written by Old Timer in the Chicago Tribune some years ago when the soldiers' bonus bill was vetoed:

I remember the dawn of that cold, rainy day,  
Our first time over the top;  
How for hours we crouched in the mud of the trench  
With our hearts going flippity flop.  
And at last came the word—and over we went  
Where the bullets whistled and spat;  
And shrapnel screamed 'round like devils from hell  
But—nobody vetoed that.



I remember a night in a thick, marshy wood,  
When the boche gave a chlorine-gas ball;  
We couldn't fight back, we were held in reserve—  
Had to stay there and take it—that's all.  
And thicker and thicker the stinking fumes grew  
While we lay there sprawling out flat,  
Choking and cursing—but holding our ground;  
And nobody vetoed that.

I remember the nights when with pick and spade  
We scooped shallow graves for our dead;  
No songs could be sung—there were snipers around—  
Not even a prayer could be said.  
We had to work fast, for with coming of day  
The guns would start in to chat;  
Without coffins or blankets we laid them away—  
And nobody vetoed that.

The President in his veto message complained about the cost. This seems strange in view of the fact that the Government is now spending money like drunken sailors. The second deficiency bill carries an appropriation of \$68,000,000, some of the items in it being \$10,300,000 for a new Post Office Building in Washington; \$10,000,000 for a Department of Justice Building; \$4,750,000 for a Labor Building; and a like amount for an Interior Building; and \$2,000,000 for a wing to connect the last two buildings mentioned. It is all right, it seems, to spend \$2,000,000 for a "wing," but nothing for the soldiers. Other items included in that deficiency bill were \$3,000,000 for refacing the State, War, and Navy Building, and \$2,000,000 for landscaping the block bounded by Pennsylvania Avenue east and Fourteenth and Fifteenth Streets NW., and for additional land in a triangle; \$865,000 for a Public Health service building. One would have to write a book to give an account of all the expenditures of the Government which are not urgent at this time. In fact, the Government is tearing down perfectly good buildings in the city of Washington and erecting new buildings at an enormous cost simply to make Washington beautiful. As an American citizen, I would like to see Washington beautiful, but I do not want to see it beautiful by an enormous waste and expenditure such as the Government is now conducting. To tear down perfectly good buildings in order to make the city more beautiful is a crime, and when we think of wanton expenditures of the Government along various lines, the canceling of over \$11,000,000,000 of war debts, and remembering the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew Mellon, has refunded since he has been in office to the large corporations of this country \$2,861,852,286.08, we are made to wonder why the President complains about cost of adequately caring for the World War veterans. The refunds which I have just mentioned are contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 24, page 11597, in the speech of Congressman GARNER, of Texas.

Let me say in conclusion that when the President's veto of the veterans' legislation reached the House and was sustained, the Republicans stood up and applauded; they applauded the veto of a bill that every one of them had voted for on the day before. In my mind this is an act of demagoguery and inconsistency which doubtless has no parallel in the history of any legislative body of the world.

Mr. MILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I voted against H. R. 13174, a bill to amend the World War Veterans' act, which passed the House on Wednesday last. This bill was a hodgepodge thrown together in a few minutes.

No Member was given an opportunity to know what the provisions of this bill contained. It was introduced only a few minutes before it was passed by the House. It was not referred to a committee for consideration. The bill was immediately called up to be voted upon under suspension of the rules, under which the debate was limited to 20 minutes to a side, with no opportunity to offer or consider amendments of any kind.

This, of course, was done to pull President Hoover out of a political hole. I condemn playing politics with the welfare of the disabled ex-service men, who are suffering and dying as a result of their services to their country in its hour of need.

These men did not play politics during their service. I have seen the Republican fight by the side of the Democrat, and one was just as patriotic as the other; I have seen the Republican die by the side of the Democrat and one was just as brave as the other. When one of them fell mortally wounded we did not ask what ticket he voted. When we laid him at rest and raised above him a little white cross that marked a hero's grave we did not write thereon his political faith, we did not know and we did not care; all we knew was that he was a true American and had given his all for his country. So when

you legislate for these disabled men you should do it with the same spirit that they fought for you.

I served on the World War Veterans' Committee for several years and helped to write much of the law that is now upon the statute books. I know that the majority of ex-service men are as conservative about legislation as any other class of our citizens. The service men of yesterday are the taxpayers of to-day. They feel the burden of high taxes as keenly as any other taxpayer. They are not asking that you throw open the doors of the Federal Treasury to them because of their service. They are willing to carry on as long as they are physically and mentally able to do so. But they do demand that their disabled comrades who are bedridden and dying in need, be cared for in a proper manner without further delay and red tape.

This bill not only discriminates between World War veterans but discriminates between the World War veterans and the veterans of other wars. No pension bill ever passed by any Congress required that the veteran must have a 25 per cent permanent disability in order to receive the minimum rate. I wish to compare for you the rates carried in the Spanish War veterans' pension bill which was passed over the veto of the President at this session and this bill:

Spanish-American War veterans		Per month
One-tenth disability	-----	\$20
One-fourth disability	-----	25
One-half disability	-----	35
Three-fourths disability	-----	50
Total disability	-----	60
World War veterans		
One-tenth permanent disability	-----	Nothing.
One-fourth permanent disability	-----	\$12
One-half permanent disability	-----	18
Three-fourths permanent disability	-----	24
Total permanent disability	-----	40

You will notice there is a discrimination (1) as to the rates of pension granted; (2) as to the degree and nature of disability.

Under this bill the conscientious objector, who refused to wear the uniform or perform any military service, is given a pension and put upon the same plane as the man who bared his breast to the enemy.

This bill also provides that before a veteran is entitled to come within its provisions he must prove that he has not paid a Federal income tax for the year preceding the filing of his application. In other words, show that he is a pauper. Such a provision was never enacted in any other pension law.

Another injustice in this bill is in section 14. Under the present law veterans having arrested tuberculosis receive \$50 per month; the last paragraph of this section reduces this to \$25 per month.

President Hoover stated in his veto message on the Rankin bill:

But I want a square deal between veterans—not unjust discriminations between special groups—and I do not want wasteful or unnecessary expenditures.

Does this bill give a square deal between veterans? Are there not unjust discriminations? I do not think it is a wasteful or unnecessary expenditure to properly care for a sick and disabled veteran and feed his starving babies.

Our Government appropriated money to feed the starving children of Belgium, Russia, and even Germany, yet it would be wasteful and an unnecessary expenditure to compensate the disabled veterans so that they could feed their own starving children.

Under the present law the veteran can not even file proof to show that his disability was due to his service.

I do not think it a great injustice to the Government to put the burden of proof on it in these cases. The Veterans' Bureau has high salaried experts for this work, lawyers, doctors, and other specialists. And merely to put upon the Government the burden of disproving service connection, after the veteran has established a prima facie case is what the Rankin bill did. It was presumed that the disability was due to service if it developed prior to January 1, 1930. The Veterans' Bureau could rebut this presumption by clear and convincing evidence. It seems to me that this is not only fair to the veteran but to the Government.

When the Rankin bill was pending executive action, Secretary Andrew Mellon was brought forward by the administration to make his usual statement on veteran legislation, that there would be a deficit in the Treasury if this bill became a law.

There is nothing unusual about this. I remember in 1924, when the World War compensation bill was up for consideration, Mr. Mellon made a convenient error of \$900,000,000 in his estimates to show there would be a deficit. But I do not



remember of hearing any protest from Mr. Mellon when his department refunded income taxes in the amount of \$2,861,852,286.08 to certain corporations of the country. Twelve million in round numbers going to Mr. Mellon's own corporations, without going to court for a decision, even though the court has since held the recipient was not entitled to such refunds in some of these cases. I do not remember of Mr. Mellon shouting "deficit" when his foreign debt commission, with the approval of the administration canceled \$10,705,618,006.90 of the debt the nations of Europe owed to us as an honest and honorable obligation.

Neither did he cry "deficit" when he recommended giving back to the corporations of the United States \$160,000,000 in taxes due and payable this year.

This cry of "deficit" is only raised by Mr. Mellon when the veterans' interest is at stake. The men that saved and protected Mr. Mellon's millions and the millions of the 300 corporations of which he was director when he became Secretary of the Treasury in 1921.

These people who had grown fat upon the services and life's blood of these disabled men during the war. These service men are now merely asking for justice.

Mr. ESLICK. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I supported (H. R. 10381), an act to amend the World War veterans' act, as amended, and commonly known as the Rankin bill. This bill was vetoed by the President on June 26, 1930. It failed of passage in the House—the veto of the President to the contrary, notwithstanding. When this measure failed to pass over the President's veto, immediately H. R. 13174 was introduced, and consideration was at once given to it. The rules were suspended; and after 40 minutes' debate, it was passed by the House with only four votes against it.

It is safe to say that if the Rankin bill had not been pressed, there would have been no veteran legislation at this session of Congress. Not only the veterans and their organizations, but the public was demanding fair and just legislation. The administration was forced to pass relief legislation for our ex-service men. The President and his last two predecessors have wielded the veto power against relief legislation for our soldiers. President Harding vetoed the adjusted compensation bill, known as the bonus bill. President Coolidge vetoed practically the same measure, and would have denied relief to our boys had Congress not passed it over his veto. At the present session, President Hoover vetoed the Spanish-American War pension bill. It was passed over his veto, by a vote of 299 for, and only 14 votes in the House sustaining the President; and the vote in the Senate for the passage of the bill over his veto was 66 to 6.

To keep the record straight, President Hoover vetoed the Rankin bill. This veto was sustained. Then came the present bill, which in effect is a service pension bill.

The President sat by until the Rankin bill was ready for passage before he assumed leadership in destroying it. He first denounced it in the name of economy, as a deficit in the Treasury would be threatened. Of course, there was nothing to this claim. It was only an excuse to destroy the measure. The Treasury balance at the end of the fiscal year is around \$200,000,000; but when the veto came through other reasons were set out as controlling.

The bill under consideration contains 34 pages. Scarcely a Member of the House saw this bill until the road roller put it on for passage in the House. The rules were suspended and only 40 minutes were given for debate in the House. There was no time for study and consideration, yet it inaugurated a new policy that will ultimately mean the expenditure of billions of dollars.

This measure, while a step in the right direction, is not fair to the World War veterans and their dependents. Every man who has served his country in the hour of its need who is without means and has become incapacitated to earn a living should be treated alike, regardless of the war in which he served or his age. They are equally deserving.

Under the act of June 9, 1930, Union veterans, totally disabled, may receive \$75 per month, and if an attendant is needed, an additional \$25 may be received, making a total of \$100. The youngest of these veterans is past 80 years of age. His family has been reared and is no longer a charge on him. The Government is quite generous to the Civil War veterans. I do not complain—only it should be fair and just.

The Spanish-American War veteran, totally incapacitated, can have but \$60 per month. No attendant is provided for him, although he served his country just as well as the Civil War veteran. The President, by his veto, tried to limit the totally disabled Spanish-American War veteran to \$50 per month, or

one-half of the whole amount provided for the Civil War veteran under like conditions.

Then comes the World War veteran without service connection. Forty dollars per month is the limit he can receive. It is true he is a younger man than either the Civil or the Spanish War veteran; but this makes no difference—a man incapacitated by disease, either physically or mentally, is just as deserving as the man who is bowed with the weight of years. When the soldier's earning capacity is destroyed, he should have the generous consideration of his Government, and no class of its soldiers should be discriminated against. In fact, if a favor is shown, the World War veteran should have it because many of them have wives and young children utterly dependent upon them. It would take more to care for their absolute necessities.

The administration bill under consideration does not measure up to the real American standard. The widows and the dependents of the Civil War and the Spanish-American War veterans are taken care of through pension legislation. Not so in the case of the widows and children of the World War veterans who are without service connection. This bill is inequitable, unfair, and unjust to a very large number of World War veterans—especially to a great number of widows and dependent children.

I do not complain of what the Government has done for the Civil War and the Spanish-American War veterans. I have supported legislation helping these veterans and their dependents at this session of Congress. Additional provision was made for Union veterans and their widows, and for the Spanish-American War veterans.

I supported these measures. I voted for the Spanish-American War pension bill, and I voted to pass it over the President's veto. I supported the bill now under consideration, but it was only a step in the right direction. What I want to see is fair treatment to the World War boys. The rate for permanent disability, both partial and complete, as fixed for the Spanish veteran at least should have been written in this bill in behalf of the World War veteran. The same provision should have been made for their widows and dependent children as was made for the widows and dependents of other wars.

H. R. 13174, the administration bill, provides that—

Any honorably discharged ex-service man who entered the service prior to November 11, 1918, and served 90 days or more during the World War, and who is or may hereafter be suffering from a 25 per cent or more permanent disability, as defined by the director, not the result of his own willful misconduct, which was not acquired in the service during the World War, or for which compensation is not payable, shall be entitled to receive a disability allowance at the following rates: 25 per cent permanent disability, \$12 per month; 50 per cent disability, \$18 per month; 75 per cent permanent disability, \$24 per month; total permanent disability, \$40 per month.

The issue will arise on what is "permanent disability," and after the ex-service man gets it defined by the director—and those who have had experience know how hard it is to establish permanent disability—if he is rated 25 per cent permanently disabled, he will receive the pittance of \$12 per month; one-half disabled, \$18 per month; three-fourths disabled, \$24 per month; and totally disabled he receives the maximum provided by the act, \$40 per month. A totally disabled World War veteran receives two-thirds of the amount provided for the totally disabled Spanish War veteran, and 40 per cent of the amount provided as a maximum for the Civil War veteran. This is not right.

Some day the Congress will do justice to these boys. The time will come when they will receive the same treatment as the soldiers of the other wars, and a President will willingly approve the measure. He will not undertake to dictate what shall be provided for them. I shall welcome the opportunity to support this legislation. I believe the Nation should be generous in providing for our unfortunate soldiers. Under like conditions the same treatment should be accorded the disabled soldier, regardless of his age or the war in which he served.

Let us fully discharge our obligation to the ex-service man. A large number of disabled men though young in years need governmental aid, and their comrades justly demand that this be given to them.

The other body now has this bill, and a faithful effort is being made to write the higher rate of the Spanish War act into this law. The newspapers say the President will veto the bill if this is done. If we judge the future by the past, the President will by his veto destroy relief legislation to the ex-service man of the World War for this session of Congress, unless both



Houses pass the measure over his veto, which I trust may be done. The passage of this legislation is the duty of Congress. The approval, or the disapproval, of relief legislation to the ex-service men is the responsibility of the President.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Speaker, the swift-moving pension and relief legislation prompted the House to grant leave to all Members to comment upon the courses followed by Congress and its Members in their zeal to extend that measure of justice and relief which the present and future status of our Treasury may fairly warrant.

Few, indeed, Representatives or Senators, would refuse to act liberally with the veterans by way of compensation for that which they lost by wounds or disease. Nor would many of them be hypercritical as to the time following the war when such disease became manifest.

The cumbersome system called compensation originated with mingled best of purpose and prejudice of a large section of our people against the pension system which we maintained for the survivors of all our wars prior to the World War. The compensation system in theory is just, but is exceedingly difficult to administer. It is hard for veterans to learn their rights. It requires a legal education and practice to know how to obtain those rights.

One of the serious obstacles to establish a veteran's rights growing out of his war contacts is the difficulty either from war records or professional medical testimony to establish service origin for present disabilities or diseases. The authorization of lay evidence in this bill is a distinct factor in the veteran's favor.

Then the next serious defect in the law heretofore existing was the failure to provide for those veterans who having their usual vocation broken into by the war, returning to private life, under differing circumstances have suffered injuries, wounds, or disease which reduced their earning capacities, but which causes had no service origin.

It was never my thought, nor do I believe was it governmental contemplation, that our interest in the soldier ceased when he was granted an honorable discharge, containing a certificate of health. Our interest in him began when he entered the service by volunteer or draft. Our interest in him will continue while he is with us. Thereafter his widow and orphans will be our proper concern.

I voted for what was known as the Johnson bill, with Rankin amendment, recognizing at the time that it was ill-considered, and doubtful as to the number of veterans it might aid and how much it would now or later cost the Treasury.

The absence of relief provided for all those whose claim arose from post bellum causes was its greatest weakness. The expected wholesome amendment by the Senate did not materialize. The President's timely analysis and criticism of the Senate bill which would also apply to the original bill was made with a knowledge that the pension system, time honored and effective, will be the major form of relief, hereafter to be increased and extended.

To clear the record that both Houses of Congress could see their way, the direct process was to vote for the Senate amendment and then, after sustaining the President's veto, pass the new Johnson bill, which, amended by the Senate, is now the law of the land. It is generally conceded that the veterans receiving relief under this bill will be two to three times as many as under the vetoed measure. Measured by that yardstick and forecasting progressive liberalization along pension lines, with no veteran deprived of any right he now has, I voted to sustain the President's veto with the same readiness I had but a short time ago voted to override it on another pension bill.

Legislation is based upon agreement, compromise, and sometimes disagreement. Teamwork between Congress and the President should be sought rather than strenuously avoided. Disagreement should be avoided and not zealously sought.

Within these lines I believe the pension legislation of this session has been prudent and will be by the country approved.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, when I marched off to war in 1898 with my friends and comrades, as my father did before me in the stirring days of 1861, there was then no thought in my mind or in the mind of my father that we might some day have to appeal for aid to the Government for which we were so eager to fight and, if need be, lay down our lives. In 1917 thousands upon thousands of America's finest youth, the pick and flower of the country, marched off as we had done, resplendent in the glory of their courage and imbued with the finest patriotic fervor. Like us, they had no thought of pensions or disability compensation—they were animated with that mighty spirit which has made the United States the magnificent country that it is; it was their country, it was endangered by the hosts of lust and greed, and they were flying to its defense.

Twenty-five years after the Civil War had come to an end the needs of my father's comrades—those men who fought so nobly and so long to defend and preserve the Union—were recognized. Many of them were maimed and disabled and could not earn their living unaided. Homes had been rendered destitute by the loss of father and husband—widows and children had been left without the sustaining love and support of their dear ones. The maimed and disabled were pensioned; the mothers and widows were cared for by the Government in whose defense they had given up their lives and their health. It took their Government, however, 25 years to see and fulfill its obligation.

The Spanish-American War, which ended officially in 1902, saw a duplicate of the conditions which prevailed after the Civil War. Almost two decades intervened before their Government saw and performed its duty to the Spanish War veterans. In those intervening years, as in the 25 years immediately following the Civil War, the American soldiers who marched off so bravely and sturdily to defend their country had to undergo untold hardships of misery and suffering because the United States Government was not as unselfish to them as they had been to it and hesitated long before extending pension aid to them.

The World War ended officially on July 2, 1921, and now is nine years in the past. Despite the object lessons of 1861 and 1898, and the lurid pictures of suffering which have been engraved upon the minds and hearts of every thinking American citizen, the country is only now recognizing its duty to the thousands of brave American boys who so quickly saw and performed their duty to their country. Who would attempt to measure by the yardstick of dollars and cents the suffering and misery which these young patriots so unhesitatingly took upon themselves in fighting for their country? Who would dare to say that in pensioning these World War veterans we are discharging in full our debt to them? Debts like these can be weighed only in the balance with gratitude; and never are outweighed, not even by the most liberal pensions. We can not show our gratitude by performing our duty. In passing this pension bill we are discharging our duty to those soldiers; our great indebtedness still remains. We told them when they marched off to the war with Germany that nothing was too good for them. Now we haggle amongst ourselves for fear we are giving them too much, for fear we may strain the Public Treasury. Had it not been for these soldiers we might not have a Public Treasury to be so exceedingly solicitous about.

It is true that the pension rolls of the country will probably be swelled larger than ever before; but when we talk of this and compare conditions with those of the days shortly after the Civil War and the Spanish-American War, and when we think of the enormously larger sums which will have to be spent on pensions, we must not forget that this is a much larger country and a much richer country also than in those days, that many thousands more of soldiers were mustered into the Army, willing to give up their lives. Despite the fact, which is unquestioned, that many thousands more will be on the pension rolls than ever were before, we can not allow this fact to deter us for one moment from acknowledging and meeting our obligations to these veterans.

The great fact with which we are confronted now is that there are thousands of World War veterans disabled and incapacitated, some from injuries received since leaving the Army, some with injuries and sickness which probably did arise from Army service but are not provable as such. All these boys will be aided by the Government which owes them so much. In considering these pension bills we must disregard passionate political controversy and deal with it with common justice.

Our new disability law is a progressive step forward. It takes care of those who have been neglected heretofore, and yet does not disturb the rights of those who were actually disabled while in the Army. I hope in time to see all soldiers rated alike, in so far as their pensions and compensations are concerned. I hope to see a more equitable system of caring for the sick and maimed and disabled. We owe it to these boys and we owe it to ourselves. I hope in time to see the day when every soldier with an honest grievance or an honest claim to aid may secure that aid and air that grievance without having to hire an attorney, without having to travel so many miles from his home. I hope in time to see our Government more ready to recognize its duty to the soldiers who so instantly discharge their duty to the country. This country has been through the fires and horrors of war enough to learn the kind of aftermath to look for, and it is high time that it look immediately for that aftermath and make proper provisions therefor. The soldiers for whom nothing is too good



in time of war, the boys who are so glorified in time of need, should receive everything that is good in time of peace, and should be equally honored in the days of calm and happiness as they were in time of war.

Mr. YON. Mr. Speaker, ladies, and gentlemen, I had not intended to say anything more on any subject the balance of this session of Congress, but after I have observed the tactics and the results achieved thereby, by the majority during the consideration of World War veterans' legislation, the steam roller tactics, the scheming of the leadership in preventing a roll call directly on the question of Senate amendments, as was done in the House on Wednesday, I say I can not restrain myself from making some observations.

Of course, with the over 100 majority the opposition controls in this House, it would be presumed that you can control, but in the meantime it seems that your leaders would be willing and fair enough to have at least permitted a roll call on the question of Senate amendments, the most important of course, the one advancing the monthly rates of compensation to disabled veterans from rates of \$12 to \$40 per month for one-fourth to total disability, to rates of from \$10 to \$60 per month for from one-tenth to total disability.

What can be your explanation to the four million and more of the boys of 1917 and 1918, who answered the call of country, braved the perils of a submarine-infested sea, and millions of these joining with their allies on a foreign soil to fight a common enemy—and these boys, their fathers, mothers, sisters, brothers, wives, and sweethearts, depending on the Government that these dear ones were backing up during these trying times to do justice to those that lost health, or in any way became disabled to do the just and fair thing by these boys.

The start was good. Under the Democratic administration the first disability-compensation bill was passed. War-risk insurance at the very lowest cost possible was made available. The war was over, the boys came back, a presidential election, and a change in administration, and a fight on all beneficial veteran legislation ever since, with a culmination in what has taken place in this House during the past two weeks, and especially yesterday.

Of course, I know your excuse—the condition of the Treasury—but why should a recommendation be made by administrative heads, that a reduction of income taxes be made that estimated a reduction of from \$160,000,000 to \$175,000,000 would be saved to those most able to pay taxes, mostly the ultrarich and well-to-do. And right on top of that dictate to the Congress that these boys—hundreds of thousands of them—should not have any consideration for the illness and suffering that has come upon them. I want to ask you if this is fair and just. Has the Congress come to the point that it intends to legislate in the interest of the special-privileged class, help to make the rich richer and the poor poorer? The disabled and sick veterans are given no consideration, only a measly sop.

I will admit though, if the Veterans' Bureau would permit a liberal construction of the present laws that there would not be such great need for any additional legislation, but with the administration of the law as it is now being administered, looking to the conservation of the balances in the Treasury, to the extent that thousands that can not produce written and sworn testimony as to their service connection of disability. I will say they are technically barred from the benefits of a law that was passed for their benefit.

Now, in closing, I will say that even with the passage of the bill that meets the approval of the President, as it is to be administered through the Veterans' Bureau it will be very expensive in its administration on account of the necessary expenses incurred on the part of the bureau in sending these veterans to headquarters or regional offices for examination, and will in no way satisfy the veterans who feel that they are entitled to more consideration than this proposed law will permit. Nevertheless, those who are responsible for this monstrosity I hope will be held to strict accountability, for there will be more expressions of dissatisfaction heaped upon the Members of Congress than they have had to contend with in many a day.

Mr. STONE. Mr. Speaker, this session of Congress has made the most liberal contribution to the veterans of all wars of any Congress since the establishment of the Government.

A great many veterans have been remembered, and while it has not been possible to get everything that has been asked for, the Members of Congress who have made a fight for the veterans and who have voted and worked for the passage of each and every law for the benefit of the veterans feel that a great amount of good has been accomplished. I am glad to state that I have voted and worked for the passage of each and every law and for every liberal amendment that would in any way take care of those who were deserving. I wish to

state at this time that as long as I am a Member of Congress I will continue to work for, and to vote for legislation of every kind and character that will be beneficial to the veterans of all wars, and their widows and orphans.

It has been estimated that over 1,000,000 Americans, including the veterans of all wars and their dependents, will receive direct or indirect benefits from the veterans legislation passed by this Congress.

We should not forget that there has never been a time since the establishment of this Government, whenever it has been threatened and the President of the United States has issued a proclamation calling into service the sturdy manhood of our country, that they have not willingly responded to the call. They have offered their services in defense of their country without any thought of their personal interest, and have been plunged into both civil and foreign wars. We should remember that thousands sacrificed their lives, others were maimed, shell shocked and gassed, and broken in health were unable to return to their former avocation and support themselves and their dependents.

We are the wealthiest Nation in the world and we could ill afford to treat these veterans and their dependents otherwise than with the greatest of liberality.

It has been intimated that some of the veterans who are receiving pensions, compensation, and other benefits from the Government are ungrateful and do not appreciate what is being done to in some way repay them for their sacrifices. I wish to state that I find this is not true, but on the other hand they are not only thankful for the assistance rendered them by the Government but freely express their gratitude. My experience after 16 months of service in Congress has convinced me that the veterans of all wars are at all times anxious and willing to show their appreciation, and I have received hundreds of letters testifying to their gratefulness for the assistance rendered them by the Government.

I have never had a request that would be considered unreasonable, and my dealings with these veterans in all cases has been very pleasant and entirely satisfactory. I trust that I will be able to be of service to many thousands of veterans under the new legislation that has been passed by this Congress. The veterans of all wars are invited to make any inquiry, or submit any matter that requires attention, and I will see that it receives prompt attention by the various departments of the Government.

In this connection I wish to call particular attention to a matter that should be of vital interest to every citizen, and especially to the veterans who have business of any kind to be attended to in Washington before the departments. I think the public is entitled to know that a Congressman is allowed the sum of \$5,000 per year by the Government to pay the salary of a secretary and other office employees. I wish to further state that in some cases the Congressman has seen fit to take this allowance which is made by the Government, and which is in no way a part of his salary, to hire inefficient office assistants, and by placing his wife or other relatives on the pay roll, appropriate by this means the greater part of the allowance for clerk hire to his own personal use. This act on the part of the Congressman causes neglect of the work in the office, and the veterans' affairs, and other matters that should receive prompt attention are neglected, and not properly taken care of, thus working an injury directly on the veterans, and in many cases denying him the pension or compensation to which he is justly entitled. I wish to state that I use the entire amount allotted to me by the Government for clerk hire, and have in my employ the most efficient secretary, and other office employees, that this money furnished by the Government will permit.

I have always had the highest admiration for that great statesman and advocate of personal liberty, Thomas Jefferson, and I now wish to quote his own words, with reference to the placing of relatives on Government pay rolls.

#### THE WORDS OF THOMAS JEFFERSON

The public will never be made to believe that an appointment of a relative is made on the ground of merit alone, uninfluenced by family views; nor can they ever see, with approbation offices, the disposal of which they intrust to their President (Congressman) for public purposes, divided out as family property.

THOMAS JEFFERSON,  
President of the United States, year 1803.

Do you think Jefferson was right, or do you think a Congressman is right when he places his wife on the Government pay rolls, when she performs absolutely no labor for the money which she receives? It is a cheap form of graft and no real statesman should stoop to that practice, especially when by so doing the official business of his constituents has to be neglected.



Specifically referring to the matter of secretary I will state that I have employed in my office at this time as secretary, Sydney Corner, of Oklahoma City, Okla., a member of the auxiliary of the American Legion, with years of experience in handling veterans' affairs. She has the deepest feeling of sympathy for the veterans and their cause. Personal interest is shown in each and every claim handled by my office, and in many cases it is necessary to appear before the Veterans' Bureau in person. My secretary has the highest standing before the Veterans' Bureau, and has demonstrated her efficient handling of all veterans' matters.

I have as assistant secretary, Mr. Ben H. Colbert, of Oklahoma City, Okla., a Rough Rider in the Spanish-American War, a World-War veteran, a member of the American Legion, a member of the United Spanish War Veterans, and other military organizations. He served in the Cuban campaign, and as orderly to Col. Theodore Roosevelt saw active service, riding by the side of this great American, who was his personal friend. He is vitally interested in seeing that the requests of all veterans and their dependents receive just and prompt attention and that their wants are taken care of.

I am very thankful that I can obtain such efficient assistance in the handling of veterans' affairs, and as long as I remain a Member of Congress I will use the funds furnished me by the Government for clerk hire, and I will not place my wife or other relatives on the pay roll for my own private gain, and to the direct neglect of my constituents, and especially the veterans whose claims demand special attention before the department.

To the soldiers of America; to those who have passed on, to those now living, we owe everything. In their behalf there is no sacrifice, however great, which we should not willingly make, to in a small way show our gratitude for the suffering and sacrifice they made for our country. The Government can never fully repay them for their unselfish devotion to the defense of their country, given at the critical moment when they were called to duty. Many of these veterans have found it difficult to support their families, on account of loss of earning capacity caused by service, and I am glad that Congress has seen fit to compensate them in a small way for this loss.

I hope that another war will never come, but if it does I favor a law that will draft all property and money for the common defense, and I will never favor a draft of men unless the fortunes of the rich are pledged for the defense of the country, as well as the manhood which has always stood all the brunt of war.

Profiteering must cease, and a law should be enacted to punish those who make a profit by the instigation of war. I am in favor of sensible preparedness but do not approve of a great standing Army, or a Navy that is a burden to the people. America is a peaceful Nation but if necessary will defend its border to the last, and will never be invaded by an enemy.

In justice to the veterans of all wars, and as proof that they are grateful for the benefits they are receiving from the Government, I am going to read to you a few of the many letters which I have received from these veterans and their friends during the past few months. I will also name a number of others who have written similar letters of appreciation but time will not permit the reading of their letters in full, but I will in justice to them insert their names as a permanent testimonial to show that they are appreciative of the services that have been rendered them.

Copy of letter received from the West Side Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Guthrie, Okla., dated May 3, 1920.

NOTE.—With reference to this claim for back pay for approximately \$900 and \$30 per month.

Hon. U. S. STONE,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Each individual member of the West Side Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Guthrie wish to individually and collectively thank you for your interest in obtaining the pension for Mrs. Mattie Mundorf.

We do not believe any widow on the pension rolls needed or deserved a pension more than Mrs. Mundorf. She was simply overwhelmed by the good news, and every member of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union were pleased and heartily thank you for your interest.

Yours truly,

WEST SIDE WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION.  
Per Mrs. MAE BRAKERILL, President,  
Mrs. ANNIE M. ALLING, Corresponding Secretary.

Copy of letter from Luther E. Chaudoin, Davis, Okla., April 5, 1930:

Hon. U. S. STONE,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STONE: I am pleased to write and tell you that favorable action has been taken on my case. The Veterans' Bureau has awarded me an allowance based on a rating of from 10 per cent to 21 per cent to 45 per cent to total and back to 21 per cent over a period of six years; with a 21 per cent continuing.

I want to express my thanks and appreciation to you for helping me with my claim to a successful conclusion. I would have not gotten it if you had not assisted me, and you may rest assured that I am grateful to you, and you can depend on me.

The Veterans' Bureau has already mailed me a check for \$891.39, and the remainder of back allowance will be made as soon as I establish my dependency status. I have already sent in the necessary documents for this. With best wishes, I am

Sincerely your friend,

LUTHER E. CHAUDOIN.

Copy of letter from Mr. David J. Wenner, 923 West Tenth Street, Sulphur, Okla., dated June 3, 1930.

NOTE.—This claim has been allowed for approximately \$5,000, insurance benefits which had been pending for a long time.

Hon. U. S. STONE,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STONE: I received your very much appreciated telegram this afternoon. It is certain that, if I had not been already in bed, that I certainly would have had to go. That news, welcome as it was, and awaited so long as it has been, was decidedly a shock, albeit a happy one. Really it is very difficult to find the proper words to express what your kind assistance and persistent efforts have meant to me and my family. Perhaps when I tell you that the settlement of that claim means the final ownership of our home here, the establishment of a fund for the education of our 10-year-old son, and the providing of some little comforts and convenience for the girl who has stuck so faithfully through the times that have been anything but easy, then you will understand something of what I mean when I say that I thank you.

If ever I, in my small way, can repay in part your favors, please call upon me to the extent of my ability. Whenever you happen to be in Sulphur we would be honored if you would call and afford us an opportunity to express personally our gratitude for your efforts in our behalf.

Wishing you the best for the future, and sincerely hoping for your success in your present campaign, and a return to the House, where you have ably demonstrated your fitness and ability, I am,

Most sincerely yours,

DAVID J. WENNER.

Copy of letter from Mr. Deselms, Guthrie, Okla., dated March 26, 1929.

NOTE.—With reference to this case, \$808.32 back pay was received and pension for \$50 per month.

U. S. STONE,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. STONE: Yours regarding R. C. Lane's pension received and I am forwarding same to Mr. Lane, who has moved to a farm. I am confident this will be very welcome news to Mr. Lane and his dependents, and I wish to thank you personally for the interest you have taken in this matter.

Very sincerely yours,

F. M. DESELMS.

Copy of letter from Mr. Fred E. Hysell, Sulphur, Okla., dated October 12, 1929.

NOTE.—Claim allowed with back pay for approximately \$60 and \$20 per month.

Hon. U. S. STONE,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. STONE: I have your telegram of October 4, 1929, informing me that my pension had been allowed at the rate of \$20 per month beginning on July 16, 1929.

This is mighty fine work, and I thank you for putting this through for me so quickly.

I was for you in your former race, and I hope to be able to do you some good if you are a candidate again.

Your friend,

FRED E. HYSELL.

Notice of allowance from the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Pensions, dated May 10, 1929.

NOTE.—After this widow waited 20 years, I secured this claim which allowed for approximately \$5,372.63.

Hon. U. S. STONE,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. STONE: The claim for Rest. Pension under act of April 19, 1908, of Sarah M. Pollard, widow of Benjamin F. Pollard, Company G, United States Volunteer Infantry, has been allowed under



certificate No. 578162 at the rate of \$12 per month from February 4, 1909; \$25 from October 6, 1917; \$30 from May 1, 1920; and \$40 from June 4, 1928, and the certificate will be forwarded at an early date.  
ED. D. MORGAN, *Commissioner*.

This claim was called up by you.

Copy of letter from Mr. Herman I. Neal, first lieutenant, United States Army:

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., October 17, 1929.

Hon. U. S. STONE, M. C.,

*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. STONE: I want to thank you for the interest you have taken in my claim with the Federal Government by securing me retirement with pay as a disabled officer of the World War.

There are not words to express to you as much as I appreciate what you have done for me. I feel that you have brought about justice, and I am very, very thankful to you. I am convinced without your aid I never would have received the award.

I wish there was something I could do to repay you for your goodness. I hope that some time in the future I will be privileged to serve you with equally so much interest and sincerity as you have shown in my behalf in adjusting my claim with the Veterans' Bureau officials.

There are thousands of deserving disabled boys who are not being treated right by the rating boards and a few doctors of the regional offices of the bureau, so anything that you can do for the fellows the boys and the good people of Oklahoma will appreciate.

I am, respectfully,

HERMAN I. NEAL.

Copy of letter from Mrs. J. O. Wright, Davis, Okla., dated December 3, 1929:

U. S. STONE,

*Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. STONE: I have just received a letter from the Navy Department telling me that my son is to be transferred to the United States and will be discharged soon.

I certainly thank you for your time and attention in the matter.

Mrs. J. O. WRIGHT.

Copy of letter from Mr. Clyde Curlee, 2330 South Harvey Street, Oklahoma City, Okla., dated April 27, 1930.

NOTE.—This is for an increase of pension and this veteran is now drawing \$90 per month.

Hon. U. S. STONE,

*Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR FRIEND: Thank you for your aid in receiving the increase in pension of William V. Smith, 1814 Linden Avenue, Oklahoma City, Okla. In the rush of spring work I overlooked writing you on receipt of your telegram, stating the increase had been allowed. I worked on this case simply because I felt the increase was deserved.

Very truly yours,

CLYDE CURLEE.

Copy of letter received from Mr. C. L. Hales, the Local Building and Loan Association, Oklahoma City, Okla., dated May 22, 1930.

NOTE.—Transfer to the Veterans' Bureau hospital, Muskogee, Okla., from the hospital in Outwood, Ky.

Hon. U. S. STONE,

*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: In answer to your wire of the 19th, I wish to thank you for getting Mr. Jesse F. White transferred from the Veterans' Bureau hospital of Outwood, Ky., to the Veterans' Bureau hospital of Muskogee, Okla.

I wish to state that all concerned are very happy and very grateful to you for what you have done.

Assuring you that I wish you well in the coming campaign and that I will do all I can to help make it a successful one, I remain,

Yours very truly,

C. L. HALES.

Copy of letter received from Mr. Jesse F. White, United States Veterans' Hospital, Outwood, Ky., dated May 29, 1930:

Hon. U. S. STONE,

*Washington, D. C.*

HONORABLE SIR: Your wire of May 19 received shortly after noon of same day and closely following it came a letter from the commission inclosing transportation, letter of admission, and notice of transfer effective when the Muskogee hospital informed me of a vacant bed.

I wish to take this measure of trying to thank you and express my appreciation for your efforts in securing this transfer for me, and it is my wish that some time in the near future that I might be able to thank you personally for the many favors extended me.

In expressing my thanks and appreciation I speak for my wife and family as well, and it is our desire that in the future we will be able to demonstrate by actions more than words our gratitude.

Wishing for you and yours success and prosperity, and the realization of your ambitions, and again thanking you and assuring you of our support, I am

Sincerely yours,

J. F. WHITE.

Copy of letter from Mr. William Hutchinson, department commander United Spanish War Veterans, Ardmore, Okla., dated June 10, 1930:

Hon. U. S. STONE,

*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: Permit me to express to you, both personally and for the Department of Oklahoma, our sincere thanks for your splendid efforts in behalf of the soldiers and sailors of the Spanish War and Philippine insurrection and their dependents.

In grateful appreciation, I am

Very respectfully,

WILLIAM HUTCHINSON,  
*Department Commander.*

Copy of letter received from the United States Veterans' Bureau, Washington, D. C., dated June 12, 1930:

Brown, Artie E. XC 92 175.

Hon. U. S. STONE,

*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. STONE: Referring to your letter of June 3, 1930, you are informed that the insurance in this case in the amount of \$5,178 was awarded to Mrs. Ruth Lanham, 509 West Seventh Street, Oklahoma City, Okla., as administratrix of the estate of the above-named veteran.

Check in full settlement was mailed to her on June 11, 1930. A copy of this letter is inclosed for your use.

For the director:

GEORGE E. JAMS, *Assistant.*

A copy of letter from Messrs. Priest & Belisle, attorneys at law, 404 Fidelity National Building, Oklahoma City, Okla., dated June 14, 1930:

Hon. U. S. STONE,

*Congressman from Oklahoma,  
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: Your telegram advising that check had been mailed Mrs. Ruth Lanham received.

We sincerely appreciate what you have done for us in this matter and if, at any time, our firm or our client can serve you, please be sure to call on us.

Yours respectfully,

HARRY W. PRIEST.

Copy of letter from United Spanish War Veterans, Roosevelt Camp, No. 1, Oklahoma City, Okla., June 25, 1930:

Hon. U. S. STONE, M. C.,

*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: On behalf of Roosevelt Camp No. 1, of Oklahoma City, I want to express to you our appreciation for the fine support you have given us in passing our pension bill over the President's veto. The unanimous vote was very gratifying.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY C. ROBERTSON, *Commander.*

Copy of letter from Thos. A. Higgins, Stillwater, Okla., dated April 12, 1930.

NOTE.—This claim allowed for increase of pension which would total pension to the amount of \$90 per month.

Hon. U. S. STONE,

*House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. STONE: Mr. David Blanch, for whom you recently procured increase of pension, and his son, John Blanch and family, desire me to express to you their sincere appreciation of your efforts, and the result of them, in the above matter. They also asked me to assure you that if they could be of any service to you in any matter you might rely upon them to render it most cheerfully.

I want to personally thank you, too, for the very effective manner in which you take care of business of your constituents there, and to say that if I can be of any service in my small way I shall be glad to do so.

With personal regards, I am

Respectfully,

THOS. A. HIGGINS.

I am also making notations of a few other claims which I have handled out of the several hundred that have been presented through my office to the Bureau of Pensions and the Veterans' Bureau. Under the new law affecting the Spanish-War veterans, and the World-War veterans' legislation a great many deserving veterans whose claims are now pending, and who were unable to get their pensions and compensations on account of defect of the old law will be taken care of. The



following are a few of the many claims which have been handled satisfactorily by me and upon which settlement has been made.

George Bilyeu, 712½ West Main Street, Stillwater, Okla.; Floyd Barefoot, Route 2, Purcell, Okla.; Eldridge Burton, Elmore City, Okla.; Gordon Brewster, general delivery, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Orvill Cunningham, Harrah, Okla.; Edward George Denton, 222 West Fourth Street, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Charles K. Frazier, Soldiers Tubercular Sanatorium, Sulphur, Okla.; A. F. Goode, 3060 West Twenty-first Street, Oklahoma City, Okla.; John H. Hughs, Paoli, Okla.; Edgar D. Hemby, 113 Harrison Avenue, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Walter B. Lewis, 218 West Ninth Street, Oklahoma City, Okla.; John Morphew, Soldiers Hospital, Sulphur, Okla.; Barney Morris McCurry, Route 6, Stillwater, Okla.; Walter Neblett, 909 Second Street, Veterans' Bureau Hospital, Muskogee, Okla.; Harry Nimms, Cushing, Okla.; Lucille Perea, general delivery, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Nathaniel Patillo, Wynnewood, Okla.; Charles Tippit, Box 124, Purcell, Okla.; Mrs. J. A. Wright, Box 401, Davis, Okla.; Thomas L. Pierce, Route 1, Norman, Okla.; James Brucker, general delivery, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Louis Brussels, 811 North Brauer Street, Oklahoma City, Okla.; William Cook, 1249 Grand Avenue, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Mary E. Dawson, 304 East Eleventh Street, Oklahoma City, Okla.; John Gragg, general delivery, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Mrs. W. R. Jones, Norman, Okla.; John M. Kelly, Ripley, Okla.; William S. Kiespert, Route 7, Guthrie, Okla.; Martin Myers, Sulphur, Okla.; Calvin L. Pyles, Pauls Valley, Okla.; Thomas C. Parker, 1909 North Prospect Avenue, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Hamilton Rutledge, 1001 Cotton Grain Exchange, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Henry C. Robertson, 1401 East Fifteenth Street, Oklahoma City, Okla.; William V. Smith, 1814 Linden Avenue, Oklahoma City, Okla.; William Glenn, Wynnewood, Okla.; M. Kinney, 1911 West Eighteenth Street, Oklahoma City, Okla.

#### PRINTING THE BILL H. R. 13174 AS A PUBLIC DOCUMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed 10,000 copies of the bill which just passed the House, or as many copies as will comply with the rule with respect to cost, and that these copies be sent to the document room and made available to the Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent that 10,000 copies of this bill be printed as a public document, or so many as may come within the legal requirement. Is there objection?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if he would not order 10,000 copies showing not only this bill but all the laws relating to benefits for veterans in accordance with present law?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I may say to the gentleman that that could not be done by unanimous consent, because it would violate the rules on account of the cost being too high.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, in order to cut the matter short I will object, for the reason that this bill is not going to become law, so why print it. I object.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON THE BILL H. R. 10658

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file a supplemental report on the bill (H. R. 10658) to amend section 1 of the act of May 12, 1900 (ch. 393, 31 Stat. 177), as amended (U. S. C., sec. 1174, ch. 21, title 26), and to include the provisions required by the Ramseyer rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

#### DONATIONS OF SITES FOR PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 12343) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to accept donations of sites for public buildings, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "and so forth."

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and my reservation to object goes to the practice of Members crowding into the well of the House to present requests to call up bills, I shall object hereafter unless the gentlemen who present unanimous-consent requests present them while standing outside of the well of the House. A gentleman seeking recognition, should rise in his place and address him-

self to the Speaker, so all the Members can hear him. If each Member will observe this rule, all Members will know what is going on, and we will have better order.

Members are getting in the habit, when they want to submit a unanimous-consent request, to get down into the well, crowding up to the clerks there, and addressing the Speaker in a low tone of voice. Of course, the Speaker must know what is going on, but every Member of the House is as much entitled to know what the request is and what is going on as is the Speaker himself. The responsibility for legislation is upon every Member.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. When every Member of the House is talking to the right or left of the gentleman and causing a lot of confusion, how can the gentleman expect to hear what is going on?

Mr. RAMSEYER. We can start more orderly procedure by having those who prefer requests to present them not farther forward than the committee table here, and if the gentleman from Indiana will step back to the committee table I shall withdraw my reservation to object.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding this is a bill introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS.]

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. And the Senate amendment simply strikes out the words "and so forth."

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

#### INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF BLACK BASS

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 941) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate interstate transportation of black bass, and for other purposes," approved May 20, 1926, with House amendments, insist on the House amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. NELSON of Maine, WOLVERTON of New Jersey, and MILLIGAN.

#### AMENDING SECTION 24 OF THE IMMIGRATION ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9803) to amend the fourth proviso to section 24 of the immigration act of 1917, as amended, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 9803, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object, is that the same bill that was called up yesterday that has to do with foreign travel of officials in the Naturalization Service?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is the gentleman prepared to assert that if the bill goes to conference the House conferees will not agree to the Senate amendment adding Naturalization Service officials?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The conferees would like an opportunity to look into the cost of any movement toward naturalization officials.

Mr. CRAMTON. My objection is so that the gentleman's own committee may know, and the House may have that very opportunity. This is a bill that authorizes the payment for foreign travel of officials of the Immigration Service. It is an amendment of the immigration law which passed the House and the Senate has added this amendment that is not germane.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. At the same time I will agree that as far as possible we will oppose it; but I feel that we ought to have a free conference. I do not think we ought to be bound.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. JOHNSON of Washington, Mr. JENKINS, and Mr. RUTHERFORD.

#### AMENDING NATURALIZATION LAW

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 12487) to amend the



naturalization laws in respect of residence requirements, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 12487.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio if he will offer the amendment, which we have discussed, which will make it very clear that the provisions of the bill are applicable only to such persons who leave the country on scientific expeditions of which the Secretary of Labor has approved.

Mr. CABLE. I have sent such an amendment to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, this bill was under consideration yesterday. Can the gentleman state any good reason why it should be considered to-day instead of next Monday?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. This bill applies to only one man, a young man who is one of the greatest aviators of the world, who accompanied Admiral Byrd on his Arctic expedition. I understand that he is eligible to be naturalized as a citizen within a few months, if the time that he was abroad with Admiral Byrd is credited to him.

Mr. CRAMTON. I would like to know if the language is broad enough so that while we are taking care of one man it will take care of a few hundred others that we do not mean to take care of?

Mr. PATTERSON. In view of that fact why not bring in a special bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. There was some doubt about the phraseology of the bill, and it is now proposed to limit it so that the person must be absent on a scientific expedition.

Mr. PATTERSON. It can wait over until Monday.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, for the time being I object.

JOHN MAIKA

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 531) for the relief of John Maika, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 531, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference. The Clerk will report the bill and the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Senate amendments are as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$2,500."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$2,500."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. IRWIN, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. BOX.

LAURIN GOSNEY

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2222) for the relief of Laurin Gosney, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 2222, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and ask for a conference. The Clerk will report the bill and the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Senate amendment is as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$1,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. IRWIN, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. BOX.

ELIZABETH LYNN

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6227) for the relief of Elizabeth Lynn, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6227, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and ask for a conference. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Senate amendment is as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$1,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. IRWIN, Mr. FITZGERALD, and Mr. BOX.

MUSCLE SHOALS

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein copies of letters to the President written by J. H. Bowser, commander of the American Legion, Tusculum, Ala., Post No. 31 and H. N. Norris, commander of the James R. Crowe Post, Sheffield, Ala., favoring the pending Muscle Shoals legislation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

JUNE 19, 1930.

HON. HERBERT HOOVER,

President of the United States,

The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As a member of the American Legion, I desire to now join with the many thousands of others in making this protest for action. When your country and my country were face to face with the great world conflict, I, like thousands of others, gave my services to the defense of our country. The United States was at war, no man or resource was spared to the end that victory was achieved. That emergency has passed into history, the effects of that great conflict, however, are still sorely felt by thousands of those who, as common soldiers, fought in that conflict. All these facts are well known to you.

You know the dire need of thousands of legionnaires, soldiers of the World War; how unemployment has reduced their families to a point of severe want. As Chief Executive of this great country you are in a position to have absolute information on all phases of American life. I know, and you should know, that as Chief Executive of this great country, your duty is to relieve when humanely possible the pain and suffering of your people. However, I note from the press that you say that you would not sign the original straight Norris bill for Government operation of Muscle Shoals. Your predecessor had a chance to sign such a bill. Like the great leader, which he was not, he saved the whole project for the power monopoly who have been the sole beneficiaries of this great project since its completion.

Is it not a fact that you recently signed the Boulder Dam bill, which in fact provides more stringent Government supervision than the new Norris Muscle Shoals compromise proposal? It will be easily understood by the public, your refusal to effect acceptance of the Norris Muscle Shoals compromise, for Muscle Shoals is not adjacent to your home State of California, as is Boulder Dam Government project.

You are also quoted as saying that "it is the duty of Congress to pass a Muscle Shoals bill, and bring it to my desk to sign or veto. I will not interfere or take any hand until it is laid on my desk." How can you as President refuse to interfere or take a hand in getting action? It would be the same as the president of a bank looking on while Jessie James robbed the bank, and the president standing silently by, saying: "I will not interfere." You have allowed the public to accept the belief generally that you are a great engineer and master of economic experts. As such, you, of course, know that the American public have been robbed and is continually being robbed by unemployment, unreasonable rates, and watered stocks and bonds of the electric-power interests.

This legislation means the saving of millions of dollars annually to American farmers in the buying of fertilizer. The operation of these nitrate plants at Muscle Shoals, which are the only idle nitrate plants in the world, will help to relieve the unemployed. It is a matter of record that our farmers pay Chile around \$12,000,000 annually as an export tax on Chile nitrate brought to our American farmers. The operation of these plants will save that also. But you won't interfere. Our farmers would save \$16 per ton on their fertilizer bill, but you refuse to interfere.

The completed Muscle Shoals project would employ thousands of men, many of whom would be legionnaires, men whose children are crying in want, but you say, "It is the duty of Congress," when one word from you would save this gigantic project for the people, who paid for it. Thousands of those payments were the loss of life, while other thousands of those payments were the loss of health, and the pursuit of happiness. And yet when you look around you and see the power magnates making as much as 3,000 per cent profit in most cases, you can not sign a bill that would stop the highway robbery rates of these power monopolies nor utter a word that would benefit the whole United States, while your silence benefits directly the Power Trust.



I would like to see what kind of appearance an army would make that was made up of the power magnates of those holders of the common stock of the private power corporations. I would like to review that little handful of power army soldiering for \$1 per day, with possibly King George as the head, and with Mr. Morgan as commander in chief, and with Samuel Insull as field marshal, and the smaller boys, Tom Martin and Harvey Couch and such others, as the lieutenants in command, of the power company attorneys, who would be acting as their privates in the ranks. Could that little army hold the Hindenburg line and "keep our country safe for democracy"?

The American boys who by the thousands died to save the gigantic holdings of the Power Trust are now seeing the power interests scheme and manipulate against the consumers like myself and keep us out of a job and to make times hard throughout the country that their selfish motives may be easier attained. These power boys sat in their offices during the war-yelling patriotism, while they were extracting from two to three thousand per cent on their investment, and the soldiers were in the trenches at \$1 per, risking their lives, health, and everything in defense of our country and the power boys. Who deserves recognition? Mr. President, think.

Mr. President, you would not hesitate to call on thousands and thousands of our best men in this country to again defend it. These men, being patriotic, would accept a call, they would leave home and families with little hope of ever returning, but in times of peace they are forced to abide by the dictates of power monopolies, whose influence has kept the Muscle Shoals plants idle. Mr. President, these facts are well known to you. The Federal Trade Commission reports show the unethical practices of these power trusts; how can you side-step the issue in refusing to interfere, when your refusing to act benefits the Power Trust, and at the same time denying thousands of men, many of them legionnaires, an opportunity to provide for their suffering families.

As President of the United States you are the Commander in Chief of its Armies, and, as such, we legionnaires try to have the highest respect in the world for you, and in return everyone naturally expects you to merit the same. In this connection I would call your attention to the statement of one of your own Republican lieutenants, Congressman BERTRAM H. SNELL, who, according to the New York Times in January this year, SNELL asserted at a State conference of Republicans in New York that "his Republican friends should abandon their electric-power policy favoring private power corporations and should support whatever electric-power policy that was suggested by Gov. Franklin Roosevelt, of New York." Mr. SNELL further stating that the Republican policy had merely led to defeat in State elections. Can't you easily see that it will also lead to sure defeat of your administration, from the Executive on down? No Republican leader can claim that he is not thoroughly aware of these things, but with the prompt and proper passage of Muscle Shoals at this present session of Congress would, in a way, help greatly to redeem your administration.

Yours very respectfully,

J. H. BOWSER,

Commander American Legion, Tusculumbia Post, No. 31.

JUNE 19, 1930.

HON. HERBERT HOOVER,

President of the United States,

The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing you as an ex-service man, and as president of the American Legion in this city. You are quoted in press reports throughout the country as stating that you will not sign the straight Norris bill providing for the disposition of the Muscle Shoals project. From the same press sources you are quoted as opposed to the Government going into business. Do you mean by that to accept the viewpoint of the power monopolies who say that Government operation would be a failure?

If that be true, then it would follow that all our State and city governments, and all our big universities, the Post Office Department, the Panama Railway and power, and the Panama Canal, and the other public-operated businesses of the Nation, of which you are the Chief Executive, should be accepted as a failure. You notice that we do not even mention the highly successful operation of the public owned and operated power plants of your own home district, Los Angeles, Calif., as well as Tacoma, Wash., and many other instances we might recite that are highly successful, as well as the public owned and operated railway systems, telegraph systems, and hydroelectric power systems of Canada, which are now so successfully publicly operated.

In your Elizabethton, Tenn., campaign speech you stated your opposition to the Government engaging in private business, but you grant that the Government is already in business at Muscle Shoals. Senator NORRIS has offered a compromise proposal that would permit the Government's nitrate plants at Muscle Shoals to be leased to private operators, and provides that the Government retain control of the switchboard of the power units here, which new Norris compromise proposal, our chambers of commerce, the Federation of Labor, and most all other people accept the same as being fair and right.

The recent Norris Muscle Shoals compromise is not a straight-out "Government-operation" bill, the Norris-proposed compromise is "semi-Government-private operation," and allows the Government to only "keep control of the electric switch of its own Wilson Dam property," which is absolutely right. Senator NORRIS only asks that the Government hold the "measuring rod" the electric "yardstick," which is correct, but therein is the thing that the Power Trust objects to, and has blocked the disposition so far, but for not much longer.

In this connection, my attention is directed to a quotation from your speech at Elizabethton, Tenn., on October 6, 1928, in which you said: "In this presidential contest there is no place for personal bitterness, and I make an especial appeal to the public for fair play and sportsmanship." In this connection do you think that either President Roosevelt, or President Wilson, who made it possible for you to be President to-day, would sit silently by as you are doing and let Republican Congressman REECE get by with the statement "That he will not cast the deciding vote accepting the Norris Muscle Shoals compromise for the reason that you would not sign such a bill?" Either REECE, RANSLEY, or WURZBACH could end the Muscle Shoals deadlock now, and all three of them have clearly indicated they were acting under your influence. If this is true, the public can see no semblance of "fair play or sportsmanship" in your blocking of Muscle Shoals legislation, when there are 5,000,000 men now without jobs in America to-day, and the passing of this legislation providing for operation of the huge Muscle Shoals plants, including the construction of the \$30,000,000 Cove Creek Dam near Elizabethton, Tenn., would give some relief to said unemployment situation as well as contribute to genuine farm relief.

Congressman W. FRANK JAMES, Chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, inspected the Government's Wilson Dam and nitrate plant properties on November 2, 1929, and while here made a written report to Maj. Gen. C. C. Williams, Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, Washington, D. C., in which report he stated: "The Government's nitrate plant here could be placed in operation within a period of 60 days or less, at a cost of \$100,000, and would furnish nitrate necessary for the manufacture of ammunition to supply an army of 1,500,000 men." Chairman JAMES stated while here that "If Ford's offer for the nitrate plants here had been accepted that at least 100,000 men would be assured of steady employment in the Muscle Shoals district to-day."

The recent Norris-proposed Muscle Shoals compromise bill would immediately put the entire project to work, and notwithstanding your apparent attitude on said bill, you have previously signed a similar bill for Government operation of Boulder Dam. I can not reconcile your apparent silent attitude toward Muscle Shoals compared with your attitude in taking a hand in other legislative settlements.

When you made your only southern campaign speech, at Elizabethton, Tenn., on October 6, 1928, you made this speech in the shadow of the Wautauga tablet or monument, which monument commemorated the formation of the Wautauga Association, which in past history has been termed the first independent government established in defiance of British authority in the Western hemisphere. The Electric Power Trust, as you well know, is English controlled by a handful of big beneficiaries. Their unscrupulous methods have been exposed by the recent investigation of the Federal Trade Commission. It is gratifying to know that we still have some honest men in Washington who are working in the interest of justice to all and favoritism to none. The Federal Trade Commission has shown that the power crowd have stopped at nothing that would accomplish their selfish purpose, which facts you are familiar with.

It is also a generally known fact that the delay in settling Muscle Shoals is playing directly into the private power company's hands. How can you remain silent at this time when there is so much unemployment? Thousands of children of legionnaires are hungry for bread. One word from you would start the operation of these nitrate plants and the construction of Cove Creek Dam, and will put thousands of legionnaires to work and enable them to provide for their families.

Mr. President, let us think back a few short years; I am sure we have not forgotten the great World War, when the English in agony and despair called out "Our backs are against the wall; send munitions, send guns, send men." Who went over there and saved the English from destruction? Was it the present American Legion boys who were serving for \$1 per day in the trenches? Where were the Power Trust men in those days while the boys were in the trenches, and where are those Power Trust boys now, and where are many of the legionnaires?

Why should not the American Legion, who saved the very lives and property of the people, have as much consideration as the power interests, who have been extracting from the public as much as two or three thousand per cent on the capital invested? Let right and justice prevail. Brisbane has said, "Are we more British than American?"

It has been shown that the English-controlled power outfit, which got themselves Americanized all of a sudden, are now extracting from the American people from 2,000 to 3,000 per cent profit on their investment, while American legionnaires who saved the English from destruction are



in dire need, and in thousands of cases their families are in want, which conditions were brought about principally by the power interests. As a true American, Mr. President, how can one remain silent regarding this project? The public will hold you responsible.

Yours very truly,

H. N. MORRIS,  
Commander James R. Crowe Post No. 27,  
American Legion, Sheffield, Ala.

METHODS FOLLOWED BY THE FEDERAL FARM BOARD IN STABILIZING  
THE PRICE OF COTTON

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the activities of the Farm Board in stabilizing the price of cotton.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to extend my remarks on the above subject, I will say that there are many farmers who have stood loyally by the cooperative marketing associations from the start. One of them, in my district, is a good example. He has been largely instrumental in keeping the organization in South Carolina on its feet; has sold all of his cotton through that, and was a good enough business man to keep books and see whether the net result was profit or loss. I insert here a condensed statement of his operations in 1929 along that line.

He deposited 144 bales of cotton with the cooperatives, which he could have sold when he made the deposit for	\$12,529.74
He has received the 16 cents advance, amounting to	10,946.49
	1,583.25

The proposition now of the Federal Farm Board is to take over that cotton and all cotton held by the cooperatives at the 16 cents already advanced. This gentleman will thereby have lost \$1,583.25, unless the depositors have a share of such profit as may be made by the holding of this cotton by the stabilization committee. In other words, cotton at 16 cents, and at 13 cents as it is now, is away below the cost of production, so found by the governmental agencies. The history of cotton has been that it will not stay very long below the cost of production, which the Government agents have figured is around 20 cents per pound.

The stabilization corporation now undertakes to take over that cotton, practically foreclosing its mortgage in midsummer when the price is far below the cost of production, and then hold it off the market probably until it will react to the amount of the cost of production, and then sell it in the markets of the world. While it shows an apparent loss in taking it over at 16 cents, nevertheless it will probably make a profit of from fifteen to twenty dollars a bale before they turn it loose.

Now, my farmer who has his cotton in there has not a share in that profit, as the appended correspondence will show, though the law provides that the cooperatives shall have one-fourth of the profits which these corporations make in any such deal. See section 9, subdivision c of the farm relief act. Having had my attention directed to this, I addressed a letter to the Farm Board asking if the customers of the cooperatives would have any equity in any profit made by the stabilization corporation on this cotton taken over. Mr. Carl Williams, of the Federal Reserve Board, replied that they would not. This is his language:

This means, of course, that the farmers who put their cotton into the cooperatives and received their proportionate part of the 16 cent advance which was due them will not expect to get any more money from the cooperatives in final settlement. The Stabilization Corporation must buy the cotton direct from the cotton cooperatives and the deal must be closed at the specified price. I am sure that pending such time as this cotton may be taken over by the Stabilization Corporation, the cotton association or the Stabilization Corporation itself will be glad to release back to the member all of the cotton which he delivered to the association on the payment by that member to the Stabilization Corporation of the amount advanced to him by the cotton cooperatives plus carrying charges from the date of advance until the date of payment. If any of your clients desire to do this, I will be glad to see if it can be arranged.

It will be noted that Mr. Williams, speaking for the board, says that no matter what profit is made by the Stabilization Corporation the farmer will not share in it. He also makes the very munificent proposition that the farmer come up and pay his discount and get back his cotton. In the first place, the cotton farmer is flat. He has been ruined by poor crops and poor prices, perpetrated in so far as the prices are concerned with the cooperation of the speculators, and he is not in a position to come up and pay and get back his cotton. He committed it to the cooperative association to be held until such time as it could be properly and profitably marketed. Now,

instead of doing that, the cooperative association is allowing the Stabilization Corporation to sell it, practically under mortgage, when cotton is 6 cents under the cost of production, selling at the lowest price in many years, and expecting the farmer, instead of having his cotton held by the cooperatives until at least the cost of production can be gotten for it, to come up and pay the advance which has been made and take back his cotton.

Now, the farmer may be a fool in some respects, but I do not think any of them will be so foolish as to pay 16 cents for this cotton when they can buy it on the market for 13 to 13½ cents.

I will say further that if the Farm Board wants to retire cotton and relieve the market, they are pursuing a most foolish policy. They are taking over at 3½ cents above the market price the cotton in the hands of the cooperatives, which is already in a position to be held until a proper market develops, and thereby making a loss on this very purchase of \$15 a bale; whereas they should go on the market and buy 1,000,000 bales of cotton at 13 cents and on that million bales save \$15 a bale; to wit, \$15,000,000, leaving the cooperatives with all their cotton to get the benefit of the bulge in price which that operation would probably bring about.

I am not familiar with their stabilization of the price of wheat, but I am informed that wheat has this week been at the lowest price in a long, long time, and surely cotton has gone down the toboggan and landed in the swamp at the foot, and my friends from the wheat country say that it has the company of wheat also.

I think we provided a workable plan for these propositions when we passed the farm act, but I think there was a cog slipped somewhere when they selected Mr. Williams to represent cotton on the Farm Board. I do not know where the wheels are in the head of the wheat fellow, but I surely do not want any more stabilizing of cotton which brings it down to 13 cents.

SPEECH BY HON. HARRY C. CANFIELD, OF INDIANA

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein a speech made by my colleague, Mr. CANFIELD, on the night of June 24, at New Haven, Conn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I herewith insert a speech made the evening of June 24 by my colleague Congressman HARRY C. CANFIELD, of Indiana, at the Democratic State banquet at New Haven, Conn., given under the auspices of the Democratic Town Committee of New Haven, Conn.

The speech is as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster and fellow Democrats of the great State of Connecticut, it is a pleasure to be privileged to come here this evening and meet with so many men and women in your great State, who by your presence here and the expression on your faces, show that you still believe in the principles of government laid down by the father of the Democratic Party, Thomas Jefferson, a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, and not a government principally for the few as we have had for the last nine years. It was upon these principles this Government was founded, and it is upon these principles it must stand if it is to be a government with equal opportunity to all, as it was intended it should be.

In the early history of our country we find that some of the leaders in political parties that opposed the Democrat leaders on other issues believed in these great principles of government. President Lincoln was strong for a government that gave equal opportunity to all, but from that time until 1912 when Theodore Roosevelt broke away from the stand-pat element of the Republican Party, the leaders of that great party seem to have forgotten that this was a government for all the people, and the affairs of government under their leaders were conducted, not in the interest of all the people but in the interest of the privileged class.

In 1912 the people of this country, tired of a government for the privileged class, conducted as it had been under Republican rule, whose leaders seemed to have forgotten that this was a government of, by, and for all of its people, elected as their President that great statesman, scholar, and leader, Woodrow Wilson.

As has been so ably said, "George Washington was instrumental in the foundation of this Republic; Abraham Lincoln preserved the Union and molded the several States into a single sovereignty, but it remained for Woodrow Wilson to formulate a plan by which the whole world might be saved from self-destruction, military autocracy, and in which permanent peace, international justice, and the brotherhood of mankind should reign supreme."

In six short years, with a Democratic President, a Democratic House, and a Democratic Senate, more helpful, constructive legislation than was in the interest of all the people was enacted than had been placed



on the statute books in 40 years under Republican rule previous to that time.

It was when the Democrats were in full power that the Federal reserve banking act, the farm loan act, the Federal good roads act, corrupt practice act, Clayton Antitrust Act, child labor act, agricultural extension act, workman's compensation act, vocational training act, seamen's act (freeing labor on the high seas), the graduated income tax law, and the 8-hour law for Federal employees was enacted. And during this administration the Department of Labor, the Shipping Board, the Federal Trade Commission, the Tariff Commission, and the Bureau of Farm Markets were established.

It was during the Democratic administration that the constitutional amendment, granting woman suffrage, was passed. The tariff act (known as the Simmons-Underwood tariff law), which was fair to manufacturers, fair to labor, and fair to our farmers was also passed during this administration.

During Democratic rule, 101 bills in the interest of labor were enacted, a record that we can justly be proud of.

These are only a few of the many helpful and constructive acts that were put in the statute books during the Democratic administration.

After eight years of Democratic rule, six years of which we had a President and both the House and Senate, and two years with a Democratic President and Senate, with a Republican House, came the never-to-be-forgotten Harding administration, an administration of graft, greed, and debauchery, an administration administered by its Daughertys, Falls, and Forbeses, that robbed the United States not only of money and its oil reserve, but also of the world-wide respect we enjoyed during the Democratic administration.

Then came the Coolidge administration, which was consistently subservient to big business and against the interest of depressed agriculture, the laboring man, and the average business man.

During this administration no effort whatever was made to bring those who had robbed the Government to justice until they were forced to do so. In fact, it seemed that the leaders were not prone to criticize them for the acts committed, but seemed sorry that they were caught. In passing, I might say it seems to be an unwritten law under Republican rule that it is perfectly all right to take all you can get just so you keep from getting caught.

The presidential campaigns of 1920 and 1924, as well as the congressional campaigns of 1922 and 1926, were full of promises to the farmers, laboring men, and average business men, promises that were never fulfilled, promises that were soon forgotten by those who were placed in power, and, in my opinion, never will be fulfilled as long as the Republican Party is left in power.

The campaign of 1928 is still fresh in our memories. Well do we remember the promises that were made; yes, well do we remember the things that were resorted to, to win in that campaign even the religious question was injected into the campaign.

Mr. Hoover was held up to the American people as a great superman, and they were led to believe that he could perform miracles. A little over one year of Hoover rule has proven conclusively, to the sorrow of many, that this was not true.

The Republican Party has always posed as the party of prosperity and has attributed all panics and hard times to the Democratic Party, and during the last campaign President Hoover went probably farther than anyone in the past in claiming credit for his party for whatever prosperity the country has enjoyed. In his speech of acceptance at Palo Alto, Calif., August 11, 1928, he said:

"The poorhouse is vanishing from among us. We have not yet reached the goal, but given a chance to go forward with the policies of the last eight years, we shall soon, with the help of God, be in sight of the day when poverty will be banished from this Nation. There is no guaranty against poverty equal to a job for every man. This is the primary purpose of the economic policies we advocate."

In his speech at Newark, N. J., on September 17, 1928, he said:

"The problem of insuring full-time work all the time is a problem of national concern. It is one to which government must give its attention. It is one to which government may contribute to solve." Also, in the same speech he said: "Full employment depends not only upon a strong and progressive economic system but upon the sound policies and vigorous cooperation by the Government to promote economic welfare." Also, he said:

"The Republican Party has performed unparalleled service to the employees in our commerce and industry throughout its history and notably during the last seven and a half years. Continuous employment and prosperity of labor depend upon the continuance of these policies."

By these statements Mr. Hoover substantially wrote a guaranty of continued prosperity and full-time employment for every wage earner in America. Not only were the wage earners assured that there would be continuous prosperity, but the owners of manufacturing plants, the merchants, and farmers were led to believe that they could depend upon his guaranty.

Mr. Hoover was elected by an overwhelming majority. He took office on March 4, 1929, still the great superman, and enjoying the confidence of the people of this country, and what has happened?

Within eight months after Mr. Hoover took the oath of office the worst stock-market panic to occur since before the World War took place—\$18,000,000,000 losses were recorded in one week, and that is not all. This stock-market crash caused more bankruptcies, more assignments, more business failures, and more suicides than has ever been known in American history in so short a time.

During the first five months of this year our exports have decreased \$446,746,000. Our imports have decreased \$447,013,000, which makes a decrease of \$893,759,000 in the total of our foreign commerce in the first five months of this year.

While Mr. Hoover was Secretary of Commerce he claimed that he built up a billion-dollar annual increase in our export trade. He may have been able to do this as Secretary of Commerce; but if he did, it took him eight years to build it up, and the records show that it only took a little over five months under his rule as President of the United States to have 50 per cent of this increase lost to our American manufacturers, American shippers, and American labor.

To-day we have over 5,000,000 men out of employment, and some of them starving, and between six and seven million men working only part time. If they are among those that voted for Mr. Hoover in 1928, assured as they were by him that a Hoover victory meant continuous employment, I am wondering what they will have to say about it when they are privileged to vote again next November.

Ladies and gentlemen, the labor question is a serious one. In this country at the present time we should have 46,000,000 of our people engaged in gainful occupations that are classed as wage earners. In 1928 labor earned about \$90,000,000,000, and in the campaign of 1928 Mr. Hoover said: "If it was not for wise leadership, labor would be in trouble." If labor is now unemployed, according to the statement of Mr. Hoover it has not had wise leadership. Mr. Hoover as President is now the leader, and I am wondering what has happened in so short a space of time to cause this great economic change in the country and this tremendous amount of unemployment if continuous employment and prosperity of labor depends entirely upon the continuance of Republican policies in Government as was stated by Mr. Hoover in his speech at Newark, N. J., on September 17, 1928.

My friends, the guaranty made by Mr. Hoover when he was a candidate for President has come far from being fulfilled to the laboring men of the country, for the facts are that in almost every city in the country it has been necessary to establish bread lines and soup houses, and I am told that in New York City, at times this year, lines of hungry and destitute have lined up that were two and three blocks long, and that the famous Little Church Around the Corner in New York has established a bread line for the third time in approximately 80 years.

During the 1928 campaign Mr. Hoover stated that if he was elected he would call a special session of Congress to enact farm relief and make some limited changes in the tariff that would be helpful to agriculture.

True to these promises, the special session was called and on April 16, 1929, his message was read in both the House and Senate, in which he said: "I have called this special session of Congress to redeem two pledges given in the last election—farm relief and limited changes in the tariff." (Notice he said "limited changes in the tariff.")

A so-called farm relief bill was passed, and if farm prices continue to go down as they have been since the bill was passed it begins to look like it was properly named, for if something is not done to make it possible for the farmer to get a fair price for his products he will be relieved of everything he has, for the average prices of farm products to-day are lower than they have been any time since before the World War. When farm relief was being considered it seemed that every constructive suggestion that was made was objected to by the Republican leaders, as they said it was contrary to the views of the President.

A bill establishing a farm board with a revolving fund of \$500,000,000 at their disposal was passed. Mr. Hoover said through methods established by this board, with this amount of money, the price of farm products could be stabilized, and our farmers could be put on a parity with industry, but the guaranty made to our farmers by Mr. Hoover when he was a candidate for President, like the guaranty made to our laboring men, has not been fulfilled, for, as I said before, the prices of farm products have gone down and our farmers are worse off than they have been since before the World War. When we stop to consider that farm-land values that were approximately \$65,000,000,000 in 1920 are now less than \$45,000,000,000 and when the products he has to sell are selling at less than cost of production the conditions of our agricultural sections are appalling.

I realize that Connecticut is not what is known as an agricultural State, and there may be many of you here to-night that may think you are not interested in the success of agriculture, and in this connection I must take time to say that if you feel this way, it is time that you disillusion your minds for the facts are that one-third of the population of our country is depending on agriculture, and when agriculture is not prosperous, or in other words when they do not get a fair price for their products, the buying power of one-third of our population is cut off and with one-third of the buying power of the country cut off, there is no chance for continued prosperity in industry, and in passing I want



to say that, in my personal opinion, this is one of the big causes of the economic depression at the present time.

For 10 years agriculture has been depressed. This condition has continued to get worse and the time was bound to come when industry could not continue with one-third of the buying power of the country cut off. To dispose of merchandise the manufacturer must have a market. With the farmers unable to get a fair price for their products, they were not able to buy things they needed or would have bought had they been able to dispose of their products at a fair price. So the wheel of prosperity could not continue to run, and, as a consequence, our factories are shut down and there is unemployment and distress everywhere.

In the President's message to Congress, you will remember that he also stated that he was in favor of an effective tariff on agricultural products, and that he was in favor of some limited changes in other tariff schedules where economic changes have taken place and where new industries have come into being in the last seven years; and now, after almost a year and a half of hearings and debate, a tariff bill has been passed. What a different law it is from what the American people had a right to expect after listening to the promises made by Mr. Hoover and other Republican leaders during the campaign or even after the President sent his message to Congress on April 16, 1929.

The limited changes the President favored it seems, as he has now signed the bill, were something over 1,200, of which 887 of them were advances, as the tariff bill, as it was signed by the President, increased the tariff rates over the rates in the "Fordney-McCumber tariff law" passed in 1922 on 887 schedules, many of them containing over 100 commodities.

Economists, business men, and farm organizations from all over the country have protested against the passage of the Hawley-Smoot tariff law," or as it has been called, and I think properly so, "the Grundy monstrosity."

The leading economists of the country, 1,028 of them in number, coming as they do from 179 of our leading colleges, also from some of our largest banks and most important industries, set out 12 points as to why this bill should have never become a law.

They are as follows:

- First. It will increase the general cost of living.
- Second. It will subsidize industrial waste and inefficiency.
- Third. It will inflate profits of the few at the expense of many.
- Fourth. It will hit city workers hardest.
- Fifth. It will rob the farmers it is supposed to help.
- Sixth. It will cripple manufacturers through raw-material rates.
- Seventh. It will lower the buying power of our foreign customers.
- Eighth. It will provoke foreign retaliation against our exports.
- Ninth. It will violate the resolution of the world economic conference.
- Tenth. It will jeopardize payments from our foreign investments and debts.
- Eleventh. It will increase unemployment.
- Twelfth. It will poison world peace.

The economists have been heard from. They realize in advance what the passage of this bill means to the American people. The people themselves will be heard from later on, and, in my opinion, when they realize what has been done to them by the passage of this bill the protests of the economists will fade into insignificance when we hear the protests made by the people themselves at the polls next November.

The farm organizations protested against the passage of this bill because it did not carry out the pledge that was made to them in the last campaign. They were promised that agriculture would be placed on a basis of equality with industry, but the rates in this bill fall far short of placing agriculture on a basis of equality with industry.

A large number of our leading business men were against the tariff bill because it will advance their raw-material rates, lower the buying power of their foreign customers, and cause foreign countries to retaliate against importing American-made goods.

Some of our leading business men made strong protest against this tariff bill because they realize it is not in the interest of a number of our large employers of labor and that it is bound to increase unemployment.

Australia has already ordered that the importation of 76 commodities be prohibited altogether, and that the tariff rate on 81 other commodities be increased 50 per cent.

It is estimated that we have 2,000,000 families in this country depending on the production of goods for export and another million earning their living in the manufacture of raw materials which we import in exchange for our exports. Our population has increased 10 per cent in the last eight years, and our production has increased approximately 30 per cent. Our higher standards of living have absorbed some of this increased production, but most of it must find an export market. Cut off this market and we will have more unemployment, a lower standard of wages, and not only the manufacturers and labor will be affected but likewise every business man and farmer in the country.

Much has been said about this being a "billion dollar tariff law." When we speak about a billion dollars there are very few of us that can even realize what it means, so in order that we may more thoroughly understand what this tariff law will actually cost us, let us

take up a few of the items in the bill and see just what the increases in tariff really are.

First, we will take the cement tariff, which is placed at 6 cents per hundred pounds, and affects every taxpayer in the United States.

We find the imports, 1927, 1.18 per cent; 1928, 1.30 per cent; 1929, 1.01 per cent. So the imports do not affect us to any degree and are not on the increase.

The State-highway systems built 5,908 miles; the county-highway systems built 1,145 miles of concrete road in 1928, and if the same amount of road is built as was built in 1928, average 20 feet wide, 7 inches thick, under the new tariff schedules, which is 6 cents per hundred pounds, the cost per mile will be \$769.95 extra, and the total cost to the taxpayers of the country will be approximately \$80,000,000.

In checking over the records I find that the State of Connecticut built 73 miles of concrete road in 1928, which if built under the new tariff law would cost the taxpayers of your State \$56,206.35 more than it did at that time.

A few of the other increases in tariff under this law are as follows:

The woolen schedule alone is expected to increase cost \$300,000,000 on clothes and wearing apparel.

Hides, leather, boots, and shoes, approximately \$250,000,000.

Lumber, \$50,000,000; brick, \$15,000,000; tiling, \$25,000,000; sugar, \$32,000,000; in addition to the \$216,000,000 that was paid under the Fordney-McCumber tariff law.

But you may say, we would like to know what it is going to cost us as individuals.

I will give you the advance on just a few articles.

Dress goods: Woolen, worsted, etc., now costing \$4 will cost about \$6.25.

Dress goods: Silk, now costing \$5, will cost about \$5.75.

Dress goods: Cotton, now costing \$3, will cost from \$3.30 to \$3.50.

Woolen underwear: Selling for \$2 a suit, will cost \$2.40 to \$2.50, and a \$4 suit from \$4.80 to \$5.

Ladies' hats: An untrimmed hat, now costing \$1, will cost \$1.95; a \$3 hat will cost \$4.66, and a \$3 felt hat, light weight, will cost about \$5.45.

Shoes: Bear a specific duty of 20 per cent, which makes a \$5 pair of shoes cost \$6, and a \$10 pair of shoes cost \$12. The shoe tariff is estimated to cost \$7.50 per family.

Men's wear: Assuming that a standard suit or overcoat now sells for \$35, the cost under the new tariff will be approximately \$40.

The heaviest percentage of increase in men's clothing is in the cheaper-priced suits, made in large part of wool rags, on which the Fordney-McCumber duty was 7½ cents a pound, which has been increased to 18 cents a pound, an increase of 140 per cent. It is estimated that this will add several dollars to the price of every suit of clothes by the time it reaches the consumer.

Shirts: Men's shirts, now selling for \$1.50, will cost \$2.20, and a shirt selling for \$3 about \$4.50. A workman's shirt, now costing 50 cents, will cost about 75 cents. A \$5 silk shirt will cost \$6.

Blankets: A pair of wool blankets, costing \$10, will cost \$11.50; a pair of wool blankets, costing \$5, will cost \$5.75. A pair of cotton blankets, costing \$2.50, will cost approximately \$3.50. A cotton quilt, now costing \$2, will cost \$3.

Lumber: The duty of \$1 per thousand feet on soft lumber is estimated to add from \$56 to \$105 on the humble home of the workman.

This tariff law means an average increase cost of from fifty to one hundred dollars to every average householder in the United States.

The new tariff shows approximately a 20 per cent increase over the Fordney-McCumber tariff of 1922, so that it can be said that the increased cost to consumers will be at least 20 per cent in the aggregate on the tariffs that were effective. Under the Fordney-McCumber tariff the level of prices on many highly protected articles has risen far above the general level and far above any justification for the excessive rates of that law. The same may therefore be expected of the new tariff when the present business depression shall have passed.

As has been said, this tariff law has already been called "the Grundy monstrosity," and in my opinion, it will be called many names that can not be put in print when the people themselves really understand how it will affect their living expenses.

The day the Senate passed the tariff bill there was a break in the stock market. The day the House passed it stocks went still lower, and the day the bill was signed by the President there was a crash in the stock market, which shows conclusively that the business men of the country feel that the passage of this law was against the interest of business, and that instead of improving business conditions, they will get worse, causing more unemployment and distress throughout the entire country.

You have heard much about the "Flexible Clause," in the tariff bill, and I find a great many people do not understand what it means. Under the flexible clause, the President has the right to raise or lower the tariff rates 50 per cent, as it suits his whim or interest. Under this clause he can injure one section of the country for the advantage of another section, or he can destroy one kind of business for the advantage of another.



Under the flexible clause the President is clothed with the power to declare prosperity for his friends or those who have furnished his party with large campaign contributions. When this is understood, I do not believe the people of this country will stand for the placing of this power in the hands of any one man, regardless of which party he may belong to. The power to tax and regulate tariff was delegated to the peoples' representatives in the House of Representatives, and in the Senate, selected as they are from every section of the Nation by the people themselves, and I feel they will repudiate this act when they understand what it really means.

Ladies and gentlemen, there are many other very important questions that I would like to discuss this evening, but I must stop as you have other speakers that I know you will want to hear, but I can not stop without calling your attention to two other questions which I will only refer to briefly.

From 1922 to 1929, the Government, under Secretary Mellon, refunded in taxes, credits, and interests, the staggering sum of \$860,405,898.58; and this year, so far, the refunds approved amount to over \$47,300,000, and, if other claims pending are settled on the same basis as the above, as they likely will be, they will add another billion and make the total of refunds approximately \$4,000,000,000.

Of these large refunds, the United States Steel Corporation alone has received over \$97,000,000. It is the Democrats' contention that such sums of money, affecting the pocket of every taxpayer, should not be paid out on the recommendation or authority of only the Internal Revenue Bureau and Secretary Mellon, but that at least one case should be tested in the courts to see if these payments are just, for every dollar refunded must be paid from the pockets of the other taxpayers.

Much is said in every campaign about income-tax reduction, and I have no doubt it will be one of the things they will talk about in this campaign, for the Lord knows, with the Republican Party in power and economic conditions as they are, they will have to go out of their way to find something to talk about.

The first revenue bill following the war was passed in 1921, with the Republicans in power in all branches of the Government. It was signed by President Harding on November 23, 1921. As the bill was originally framed, it granted no relief whatever to the small income-tax payers except an exemption of \$500 to heads of families. It was proposed to reduce the higher surtaxes from 65 to 32 per cent and to abolish the excess-profits tax.

When the bill was finally passed the higher surtax rate was fixed at 50 per cent instead of 32 per cent, but, at that, the large corporations and large individual taxpayers profited to the extent of \$511,500,000 by abolishing excess-profits tax and the reduction in higher surtaxes, with but very little relief to the small income-tax payers.

The so-called Mellon plan tax reduction bill was introduced in 1924, and as introduced its chief feature was to reduce higher surtax rates on the largest incomes from 50 to 25 per cent.

Under the leadership of Congressman GARNER, of Texas, that able and spirited leader who is always fighting for the interest of the common people, together with the Democratic leaders in the Senate, the bill that was finally passed was known as the Garner bill, and the surtax on large incomes was reduced to 40 per cent, and the tax on small incomes and earned incomes was reduced to a considerable extent.

The Garner plan gave greater benefits to 6,656,067 taxpayers than the Mellon plan, while if the Mellon plan as it was originally introduced had passed, it would have given greater benefits to 6,109 taxpayers of the ultrawealthy class.

The Democrats are entitled to all the credit for this tax reduction.

In 1926, the Republicans, realizing that they could not put through a plan that would be helpful only to the large income-tax payers, took the matter up with the Democratic members on the Ways and Means Committee and granted large concessions for the small taxpayer in order that the maximum tariff rate on large incomes might be reduced from 40 per cent to 20 per cent, and the facts are, when the bill was finally agreed to in conference, with the exception of the drastic reduction in the maximum surtax rates, it was more of a Democratic than a Republican bill.

Through the efforts of the Democrats on this tax bill upward of 2,000,000 small-income taxpayers were relieved from the payment of income taxes altogether, and men with moderate incomes, such as professional men, small merchants, small bankers, and others in this class were given substantial reductions.

The 1929 income-tax reduction was one that was particularly dictated by our minority leader after Mr. Mellon was given to understand that he could not put through the kind of income-tax reduction he favored which would have reduced the income taxes of those in the higher brackets and pay no attention whatever to the average income-tax payer.

So, when our Republican friends take credit for income-tax reduction, just tell them that all of our income-tax reductions since 1921, that have been in the interest of the small and medium income taxpayers, have been gotten through the efforts of the Democrats, aided, as they were, by a few progressive Republicans and not due to any effort made by a Republican President, Mr. Mellon, or the Republican leaders.

Mr. Toastmaster, ladies and gentlemen, before I close I must take time to give you a short summary of the Hoover administration.

His farm legislation is a failure.

His first year brought greater bank failures and liabilities than any year of our history.

Bankruptcies have increased in every line of our business. There were 1,340 more business failures the first five months of this year than there was the first five months of 1929.

One hundred and twelve thousand foreclosure sales of our farm lands.

Farm products are cheaper than since 1921.

Seventy per cent of the richest farm lands are under mortgage, and there are no purchasers for farm lands.

The textile industry is harder hit than any time since 1893.

Individual bank deposits were reduced 25 per cent the first year of the Hoover administration.

The sawmill business is paralyzed.

The coal miners are naked and hungry.

Railroad shipments have declined heavily.

Railway freights are 30 per cent off.

Railway passenger income cut nearly half.

Exports have declined almost \$500,000,000.

Our export balance is declining faster than it was built up.

The stock-exchange panic swept \$18,000,000,000 away in one week in Wall Street and over \$40,000,000,000 altogether.

Practically every line of industry is at a standstill except a few mammoth corporations.

Wealth is centered in a very few hands at the expense of the masses.

Labor is asking work; and the answer, "there is no work."

Labor was promised the full dinner pail. It has received an empty pocket.

The executive branch of the Government has been converted into a commission form of government.

Mr. Hoover, in his campaign speeches of 1928, as I stated before, substantially wrote a guaranty of continued prosperity and full-time employment for every wage earner in America if he was elected. What has become of these guaranties?

Why is it the administration under Mr. Hoover, the man that was held out to the American people as "the great superman," "the man that could perform miracles," has been an absolute failure? The answer is lack of leadership, lack of a constructive policy, and the failure to even try to fulfill the solemn promises made during his campaign.

My friends, from the days of Lincoln the letters "G. O. P." have meant "Grand Old Party," and really stood for something up until 1921, but from the Harding administration up to 1930 it meant "greasy oil party," but now that the "Grundy monstrosity" has been passed to Congress and signed by the President it stands for "Grundy-owned party."

Mr. Toastmaster, ladies and gentlemen, again I want to say that it has been a great pleasure to be with you here to-night, and when I go back to Indiana, as I expect to do in a few days, I will carry with me pleasant memories of this evening, and when we go into the campaign this fall, fighting for the principles of government that mean equal opportunity to all and with special privileges to none, I shall think of you and know that the Democracy of this great State is fighting for the same principles of government, and may success be yours.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BACHMANN. Yesterday the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] obtained unanimous consent that the bills on the Private Calendar would be in order to-morrow. To-day a rule was agreed to providing for suspensions. What will be the procedure to-morrow? Will the Private Calendar be interrupted at any time any Member moves to suspend the rules?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not intend, so far as he knows now, to recognize for suspensions either to-day or to-morrow.

Mr. BACHMANN. Then the Private Calendar will proceed uninterrupted?

The SPEAKER. Just the same as any other privileged business.

#### PROMOTING PEACE AND PREVENTING WAR PROFITS

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article prepared by myself and published in the American Advocate of Peace in 1927.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks I am reprinting an address which I delivered to the Women's Conference of Defense in the Memorial Continental Hall in March, 1927, which was later published in the RECORD, and also published in the Advocate of Peace, the official organ of the American Peace Society, for April, 1927.



As the attention of the Congress and many of their fellow citizens has recently been attracted to the general subject in connection with House Joint Resolution 251, which the President will sign on to-morrow, June 27, 1930, it occurs to me that this material may be of some service in clarifying thought upon the subject. I submit that there has been much hazy thinking and some rather loose talking concerning the subject. It is a very profound and far-reaching question—one that affects nearly all phases of our life—and it is natural that there should be great diversity of opinion as to the manner by which to accomplish the result. I think that 95 per cent of the people agree that the object is very desirable, but more than 95 per cent dispute and disagree about the procedure and the method of obtaining the desired end. It is for the purpose of analyzing the subject and offering some suggestions as to the limitations that must be placed upon whatever plan may be adopted that I am now offering again this material to the House.

#### ONE PART OF THE PEACE PROGRAM

By Hon. JOHN J. MCSWAIN, Member of Congress from South Carolina

The problem of peace, like all questions where the factors are human, is many-sided. There is no single specific to cure the social ill called war. I am offering the following thoughts on one aspect of the case, especially as it relates to the "will to peace":

The Constitution of the United States has been universally appraised as the highest perfection of wisdom yet attained among the fundamental documents of government. Many particular parts have been singled out from time to time for special consideration and commendation. I do not remember ever to have seen any particular discussion of the wisdom and significance of having lodged the power to declare war in the Congress. Among all the older nations of the world the power to declare and commence war had been lodged exclusively with the executive power, so that kings and emperors had made war, from time immemorial, to suit their own interests, ambitions, or whims, and consulted the representatives of the people, if any there were, only after the commencement of war, in order to procure the financial resources wherewith to carry on such war.

But the erection of the American Republic of Republics, the commencement of a great Federal State in this Western Hemisphere, had as a background the fundamental conception of the Declaration of Independence, that "governments rest upon the consent of the governed," and exist to secure the life, liberty, and property of the people. Therefore it was but a logical application of this fundamental premise that the Constitution makers should propose, and that the people in their several State conventions should accept, a Constitution that lodged the war-making power in all the Representatives of all the States.

#### THE PEOPLE, THROUGH CONGRESS, DECLARE WAR

The President alone conducts diplomatic relations with other nations, but the President can make treaties only by and with the consent of two-thirds of all the Senators. This was a hitherto unthought-of limitation upon Executive power. It had therefore been conceived as preposterous that the people's representatives should have a veto power in the making of treaties between the royal rulers. But this limitation of power is constantly in the minds of Presidents and their executive advisers in the negotiation of treaties and, doubtless, has ever been a wholesome and restraining influence. Though the President is unrestrained in conducting international affairs, yet he must and does feel constantly the restraining check that his international policies can not be enforced with physical power in war without the approval of both Houses of Congress. But the principle runs further still back.

The President must calculate upon receiving the approval of an overwhelming majority of the individual citizens of the Republic. It is constantly in his thinking that Members of Congress must respect and heed the wishes and feelings of their constituents. The President remembers that Members of the House of Representatives are all elected every two years, and that one-third of all the Senators are elected every two years. Therefore, the President must be so cautious and prudent in handling international situations as to feel sure that the same will be approved by a clear majority of the people. If the President fails to take these fundamental conceptions into consideration and rushes headlong and unadvised into complications with foreign countries that can be settled only by use of physical force, he may find himself greatly embarrassed by failing to receive the support of the Congress and be, therefore, compelled to retreat from his diplomatic predicament.

#### NO AGGRESSIVE WAR BY AMERICA

This particular lodgment of the war-making power in the hands of the Representatives of the people insures our Nation against a policy of aggression. The Constitution makers all knew, from either personal experience or close observation, the horrors and demoralizing and destructive attributes of war. But they were wise men and realized the forces that had been operating upon mankind and among nations since long before the beginning of recorded history. Our forefathers, who laid the foundation of this Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, well knew the ambitions and covetousness that from time to time seize the rulers and ruling classes of nations. Wisely, therefore,

did they lodge in the central Federal Government the sole and exclusive power of declaring, conducting, and concluding war.

Many powers of sovereignty were left, and some still remain with the several States. But in the interest of the general welfare and common defense the war-making power was placed with the one government that represents all the people of all the sections. This Constitution conferred upon the Federal Government not only the power to declare and carry on war but the power to "raise armies" and the power to "support armies." The Constitution likewise conferred on this Central Government the power to "provide a navy" and to "maintain a navy." There is far-reaching significance in these words, to "support an army" and to "maintain a navy." They imply more than enlisting men and building ships. They imply the power to acquire by the exercise of the supreme and absolute sovereignty that must rest in any nation to take whatever physical resources and materials may, in the judgment of the Federal Government, be necessary for the proper "support" of that army and for the proper "maintenance" of that navy.

#### NO "VETO" BY THE PEOPLE AFTER WAR IS DECLARED

Some have argued that while the Constitution says that Congress may "raise armies," it means that it may only open recruiting stations and offer compensation and by a beating of drums and waving of flags try to induce men to volunteer to enter the Federal Army. It has been argued that to confine the raising of armies to the volunteer system would be a wise and salutary restraint upon Congress in declaring war, so that the people by refusing to volunteer could virtually "veto" a declaration of war by Congress. But the Supreme Court of the United States has in several cases solemnly and unequivocally sustained the power of Congress to reach with supreme and sovereign hand and "take" by selective-service draft such human instrumentalities, either men or women, as the Congress may in the exercise of its power declare to be essential to the raising of armies in order to provide for the common defense.

By the same reasoning, by the same inescapable logic, it must follow that the power to "support" the armies thus raised is unlimited and unrestrained and may be exercised at the uncontrollable discretion of Congress. It therefore remains only for the Congress, with the approval of the President, to say how these armies, raised to defend the Nation's life, shall be supported.

#### POWER TO "TAKE" WAR SUPPLIES

Heretofore the usual policy of the Government in the supporting of armies has been the "volunteer system." People have been begged and cajoled into buying bonds essential to finance armies in the field. By the same reasoning it has been argued that to leave the supporting of armies upon this volunteer basis would amount to leaving with the people the "final veto power on war." Congress may declare the war and may by a selective-service draft so formulated as to produce the least dislocation in the industrial and social life of the Nation take those persons that may be best spared from the homes and the farms and the factories and the professions of the Nation; yet after the armies have been "raised" and are in the field and are at the front and are facing the foe they may be totally paralyzed by the failure of the people back home to "volunteer" sufficient funds to continue the fight. Such contemplation sickens the heart of the genuine patriot. The same power that gives Congress the right to "take" the man from his family and from his farm and from his factory gives Congress the right to "take" such of the produce of the farm and such of the product of the factory as may be necessary to "support and maintain" the soldier in camp and in field and in trench.

#### PRUDENCE AND CAUTION IN DECLARING WAR

As Americans we believe in and insist upon freedom of opinion and freedom of expression of opinion, either by mouth or by the press. There should ever be the amplest discussion in Congress and in the country before war is commenced. All groups of opinion should be tolerantly heard. The President and the Members of Congress should solemnly contemplate all the possible consequences of an entry into war. They should patiently and prayerfully seek to avert war. Only actual defense of our physical integrity or of our national principles and honor, which are more than life itself, should ever provoke us to war. God has been good in gathering some of the choice pioneer spirits from many nations and planting them upon this new continent, free from the traditions and customs of the feudal nations, and in permitting them to develop here a civilization unrivaled in power and in variety in all the annals of time. The President and the Congress should and do contemplate the fact that the nations of the whole world are becoming so interrelated by commerce and communication as to make it practically impossible to localize war. The war from 1914 to 1918 is universally described as the World War, and yet it may be fairly concluded that its vast proportions will be far exceeded by the next clash among the nations. Like a prairie or forest fire, when once the fury of war commences no limits can be set, no bounds prescribed, no time fixed, and no measure set.

#### WAR, ONCE DECLARED, BINDS EACH AND ALL

But after all voices have been heard in the Nation, after the President, with full realization of the responsibility, has pronounced the situation



such that war alone is the answer, after the Congress, conscious of direct responsibility to the people shall have declared war, then, in my humble opinion, the case is foreclosed, judgment has been rendered, the matter has had its day in court, and henceforth no man dare deny his individual obligation to contribute to the utmost limit of his power, either by direct participation as a soldier or by direct contribution to the material and financial support of the Army and Navy. From the very moment that Congress, representing all, declares war, it binds every citizen, whatever may be his private and individual judgment of the merits. It becomes the law of the land, and henceforth the only course for every person is to help to fight it through. There must be no "vetoing" of this war-making power in Congress. If adequate volunteers do not rush to the colors, the country may "command" her sons and daughters and "compel" them to go. If adequate resources are not voluntarily contributed, then by the same power, for the same purpose, the Congress can "take" whatever the Army and Navy may need in order that the full force of the military power may be exerted.

#### JUST COMPENSATION FOR ALL PROPERTY TAKEN

But we are reminded that one part of this very same Constitution, to wit, the fifth amendment, declares that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation therefor. When properly understood, the fifth amendment offers no obstacle to the war-making power of our Government.

It does not provide that private property shall never be taken for a public purpose, but merely prescribes that payment shall be made therefor. Such provision is wise and just. It would be manifestly unfair to take one man's factory or one man's railroad or one man's coal mine or one man's farm or one man's steamboat and use the same in carrying on war and make no adequate compensation for the use thereof, while other citizens, under equal obligation to help carry on war, have their factories or their railroads or their coal mines or their farms or their steamboats untouched and unharmed. But the fifth amendment does not say that the property shall be paid for "before" its use, and merely provides that at some time "just" compensation shall be made. Therefore, in the emergency, whatever property is needed may be taken, and taken instantly, and thereafter just compensation made, and that compensation must be "just" not only to the owner, but also "just" to the public that pays. "Justice" means fairness and reasonableness under the circumstances. Therefore, justice requires that no fabulous, fictitious, and inflated war-time prices shall be paid for property taken and used. The same principle was applied in making just compensation for "man power" during the recent World War. Congress had prescribed the monthly pay for soldiers to range from \$30 a month upward. But after the war good conscience and justice, not legal obligation, declared that such compensation was inadequate and, after much discussion, Congress passed legislation to adjust and pay additional compensation for the services of the soldiers. There was no constitutional obligation to do this.

Congress may draft the soldiers without providing one single cent of compensation, even during the period of service. But would Congress do such an unjust thing? Members of Congress know that they are answerable to the soldiers, and under our system of government the voice of the people is finally supreme. Therefore, the provisions of the fifth amendment merely conform to the ideals of republican institutions and demand a just exercise of the war-making power.

#### EQUALIZE BURDENS OF WAR THROUGH "POWER TO TAX"

But Congress has another power, unrestrained, unlimited, both in war and in peace, and this power may be exercised to insure justice in distribution of the burdens of war. It is the power to levy and collect taxes. It is a fact that many do not realize that about 40 per cent of the revenue raised and expended by our Government during the period of the recent war was raised by taxation. Many conservative and experienced and well-informed men who had intimate contact with the administration during the war have expressed the opinion that if there had been no inflation of prices, if a peace-time average of prices had been maintained by force of law during the war, the money cost of the war would have been reduced by at least one-half. The average price level of all commodities during the World War was nearly two and a half times the average peace-time price. Bringing these two facts together, we find that if prices had not become so much inflated we could have financed the war merely upon the taxes that were collected and without the issue of a single bond; and if we had done so, we would have been to-day debt free and would not have a mortgage in the form of bonds upon the earning power of the people of this country aggregating more than \$20,000,000,000 that will require the labors of two or three generations to discharge.

#### NO DRAFTING OF LABORERS

There has been much confusion of thought and much loose and ill-considered utterance in connection with the subject of what is commonly described as "universal draft," and "universal mobilization," and "drafting of wealth to make war," and other phrases of like import. Some, with sweeping and irresponsible generalization, have declared that the whole Nation, with all her resources, must be instantly militarized, that martial law must prevail everywhere, and that men and women, old

and young, even children, with all that they have, must be considered as in one mighty camp, subject to military discipline, to do and to give whatever those in authority may direct. Some have leveled their anathemas at men who labor with their hands and have heretofore received wages of eight and ten and fifteen dollars a day for work as civilians, while soldiers were suffering and dying in the trenches at a dollar a day. Others have directed their maledictions at the wholesalers and forestallers and engrossers and speculators and manipulators who cornered the market for essential commodities and demanded and received fabulous prices and profits, became millionaires in a day, and thus capitalized and commercialized the calamity of war and grew rich out of the necessities and sacrifices and sufferings of the Nation.

I feel compelled to say that progress in the direction of legislation, looking to a fairer and more just and more equal distribution of the hardships and inconveniences and sufferings of war, has been delayed by reason of the excessive claims and demands of some of the advocates of such legislation. Personally, I believe it would be unwise and imprudent and impracticable to undertake the conscription and militarization of manual laborers, whether for use upon shipbuilding or house-building or road building or factory working or farm working or elsewhere. It is my belief that only the fighting forces and those agencies directly contributory thereto, such as medical, quartermaster, etc., should be taken from the civilian population by selective-service draft. To do otherwise would greatly dislocate, and might paralyze industry, mining, and agriculture. The military authorities would not and could not know how to distribute the workers among the factories and farms. The psychological factor must not be ignored. Human beings are not machines. They have feelings and thoughts. There are limits beyond which they will not endure. The overwhelming majority of the people must first be convinced that a war is just and worthy of any sacrifice, even death, and then, when it is declared, public opinion, as well as force of law, will compel the acquiescence of any small dissenting minority into conformity with the plans and efforts of the Nation to raise and support and maintain the armies and navies.

#### NO MILITARIZATION OF INDUSTRIES

In like manner, enthusiasts and idealists have maintained that all the material property and all the financial resources of the Nation must be instantly poured into a mighty national war hopper, there to be employed as military experts may determine necessary in the conduct of war. Such a proposition is preposterous to practical minds. The men who in peace time have built and operated industries can operate them more efficiently in war than Army officers can. They know how to manage labor in order to get the most satisfactory results. If all property were appropriated and commandeered and dumped into the war machine, of course, there would be no incomes to be taxed, and consequently no source of revenue wherewith to pay that just compensation required by the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

#### A SANE PROGRAM OF JUSTICE

Then, what is a fair and reasonable program for the conduct of war so as to bring about a more just and equal distribution of the burdens of war? We believe that the war is the whole Nation's business. It is not the affair merely of those in the Army or the Navy. The soldiers and sailors have no more at stake than the civilians back home. The war is everybody's business. If the cause of the war is not such as to justify a contribution to the limit of his qualifications and capacities and resources by every citizen, then we ought not to be in the war, and Congress should carefully consider this aspect of the problem before declaring war. But this equalization can not be theoretically and mathematically exact and ideal.

It is a practical world we live in, and war is an abnormal condition and fortunately very occasional and temporary, and should be so conducted as to result in the minimum of dislocation and demoralization of the existing order of things. Therefore, in addition to the exercise of the power of drafting soldiers and sailors by selective service, and in addition to the power to commandeer and take necessary physical property without delay, subject to consequent compensation, there are two outstanding measures that should be taken at the outbreak of another war. We should have our minds made up in advance on these matters and, if possible, the outlines of general legislation should be placed upon the statute books now and we should not wait until the heat and excitement and the tumult of war in order to legislate. The first of these is the stabilization of all prices. This can and must be done by the fiat of law. Only the emergency of war could justify such an artificial and unnatural mandate.

#### STOP PROFITEERING BY STABILIZING PRICES

The stabilization of prices as contemplated by those familiar with the details essential to carry out this program of seeking to equalize the burdens and inconveniences of war is not price fixing as ordinarily understood. It does not mean picking out different commodities and prescribing by statute the prices for which the same may be sold. But it does mean taking the prices of all commodities as they are found and ascertained to prevail in a free market at a fixed date, say, 90 days before the declaration of war, and prescribing that the prices so prevailing shall be observed in transactions between citizens and in transactions of citizens with the Government.



This is fair and just. The price of any commodity is a relative matter, economically considered. The real price is the quantity of commodity or service that must be given for a given commodity or the quantity of service or commodity that may be received for a given commodity. The excuse made during the war for the pyramiding of prices was that the raw material and labor, rent and interest, and other factors going into other commodities had risen and were continuing to rise, and, in order to meet these rises, the prices of manufactured articles must be raised. In turn, labor contended that what it had to buy and the rents it had to pay had gone up, and it must have more wages. The merchants claimed that not only had commodities advanced but store rents advanced, clerk hire advanced, and taxes advanced, so that they must increase prices. These retail prices again, in their turn, affected the wages of the laborers and the prices of raw materials. So this vicious circle swung rapidly around, rising constantly higher and higher, to the terrific peak of more than 250 per cent of normal prices. The stabilization of prices will eliminate such excuses for price boosting, and the result will be equality and fairness to all parties concerned.

#### "PAY-AS-YOU-FIGHT" PROGRAM

The next step that practical men, bent upon seeking, so far as possible, the ideal of justice among all citizens in the duty to make and carry on war, is to understand in advance that taxes, heavy taxes, burdensome taxes, will be imposed to meet the current expenses of the war. The slogan should be, as far as possible, to "pay as you fight," so that as the soldier sacrifices time and blood and life in carrying on at the front, the taxpayer back home, conducting his business, living with his family, shall contribute from his substance the material things necessary to satisfy the current demands of the fighting forces.

The issue of bonds to finance the war should be reduced to a minimum, if not entirely eliminated. Undoubtedly, the tremendous inflation of credit and currency and prices during the World War was due in part to the stupendous issue of bonds. These bonds were largely carried by being floated at the banks and the credit and currency of the people were almost doubled. But some may protest that to stabilize prices would eliminate war profiteering, and to eliminate bond issues would prevent inflation, so that there would be no unusual stimulus to business and, in fact, there might be an apparent stagnation, thus resulting in a diminution of incomes which, in turn, would result in a diminution of income taxes and, if the war should be financed as fought, taxes might be so heavy as to amount in fact to a capital levy. That chain of argument is considered by its makers as reducing the pay-as-you-fight proposition to an ad absurdum. But I refuse to be frightened by the thought of even a capital levy in order to carry on war. At most, it can but mean that a very small percentage of the existing capital reserves of the people shall be taken for the extraordinary and urgent needs of the Government in time of war.

#### HUMAN LIFE HIGHER THAN MATERIAL PROPERTY

Does not the man at the front, and all those under arms cooperating with him to make his fight effective, submit to a capital levy to a very real and even terrific degree? The best part of the assets and capital of the young man is his body, his health, his time—yea, his life. In order to defend the Nation, in order to make it secure to every man and woman within its bounds, in order that all may equally enjoy the blessings of this Nation, the strongest and best of our young men are called out to give, in unstinted measure, the riches and vested rights of health and strength and life.

Is it fair, is it just, is it in conformity with that fundamental American conception of equality of rights and equality of obligations, that some of our citizens should be called upon to give their all to defend the Nation's rights and life, and others, at the same time, be not called upon to make a sacrifice of a small proportion of accumulated capital? I recall these words from the inaugural address of President Warren G. Harding, March 4, 1921: "There is something inherently wrong, something out of accord with the ideals of representative democracy, when one portion of our citizenship turns its activities to private gain amid defensive war, while another portion is fighting, sacrificing, or dying for the national defense."

#### JUSTICE A FACTOR IN NATIONAL DEFENSE

To make effective such a program tending toward a just and fair distribution of the burdens of war is the greatest step in the scheme of national defense. It will mean that all the resources of the Nation will be directed instantly upon the outbreak of war to the making and gathering of such a combination of human, material, and financial resources as must be well-nigh irresistible. Further, it will mean that among the men who are fighting and directing, among those sacrificing and suffering, there will not rankle that sense of injustice and of unfairness at the thought that others are not only escaping from the obligations of such a service but are actually commercializing the Nation's needs and profiteering upon the Nation's peril. There is an inherent and indefinable consciousness in every human breast of what is just and fair and right. Education may clarify its definition but can neither create nor destroy its existence.

#### "PAY AS YOU FIGHT" AND NO PROFITEERING INSURES PRUDENCE

While this program of invoking all the resources of the Nation to cooperate in one combined effort of war when war is inevitable insures military efficiency, yet it is at the same time one of the surest guarantees that our Nation will never embark upon an aggressive and unjust war. We are a peace-loving people. We know that we may best accomplish our mission to build up a great Christian civilization for the blessing of our own people and to serve as a shining example to all others only while peace prevails. But we are vividly conscious of our obligation to the ideals of the Republic. We feel that these ideals can only be achieved under conditions of undisputed national security. Much as we love peace, and will insist to the limits of patience upon its preservation, yet, as a practical people knowing the plain lessons of history and the teachings of bitter experience, we refuse to live in a fool's paradise and to bury our heads in the sands of a false sense of security. But the program here outlined, of no war profits and of heavy war taxes, will prove an efficacious deterrent to the rash and ill-considered agitation of chauvinists and militarists. It will compel certain great financial interests that control the mighty metropolitan dailies to think carefully and to speak mildly in crucial times. If the capital that controls newspapers knows that it can not profit and may suffer some of the burdens of war, it will be cautious and prudent in editorial utterances. The man on the street who knows that he is unfit by age or physical infirmity to bear a soldier's part in war will restrain his tongue and no longer agitate for war if he realizes that he must contribute of his substance, even to the point of sacrifice, in order to carry on the war.

#### RIGHTEOUS WAR OF DEFENSE

With all selfish motives of pride and profit by war eliminated, with the hysteria and delirium of war excitement checked and restrained by the thought of heavy financial burdens, we may feel sure that one motive, and one motive only, may ever impel the good people of this great Republic to take up arms against another nation. That motive will be the defense of either the physical integrity or of the international rights of the Nation. With a war caused by and based upon such a condition, with a situation confronting all the people, that means either supine submission to a foreign will or fighting in defense of the Nation's rights and life, there can be no question but that any war declared by Congress will be a just war. Being just, being righteous, being backed by the heart and conscience of the overwhelming majority of the people, the law of selective service for human beings and a law to prevent profiteering by the stabilization of prices and to require the equitable contribution of the sinews of war by those having capital will not be a heartless mandate to compel the sullen obedience of the people to a harsh war program, but will be merely the legal measure of what all the people will cheerfully do to defend the Nation's cause.

#### A NEW AMERICAN SLOGAN

Therefore are we not justified in advancing one step further in the crystallization of national ideals into well-remembered phrases that express the heart and soul of Americanism? For more than 125 years American citizens of all sections and of all parties have acknowledged that the essence of American institutions finds a voice in the phrase "Equal rights to all and special privileges to none." To that incomparable expression of the peace-time policies of our Nation, let us now, while the lessons of the late war are still fresh in every mind and heart, write upon the statute books of this Republic laws looking toward the equalization of the obligations and hardships of war, and phrase this other epitome of the American war-time policy thus: "Equal burdens and equal sacrifices for all and special privileges and special profits to none."

#### SALE OF COLUMBIA ARSENAL, TENN.

Mr. ESLICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2156) authorizing the sale of all of the interest and rights of the United States of America in the Columbia Arsenal property situated in the ninth civil district of Maury County, Tenn., and providing that the net fund be deposited in the military post construction fund, and for the repeal of Public Law No. 542 (H. R. 12479), Seventieth Congress, with Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 2156, with Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the Senate amendments. The Clerk will report the bill and the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Senate amendments are as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "the" and insert "The."

Page 2, line 2, strike out "the" and insert "The."

Page 3, line 14, strike out "the" and insert "The."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.



The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Senate amendments will be considered as having been agreed to.  
There was no objection.

#### COTTONSEED TRUST INVESTIGATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the Cottonseed Trust investigation, and to insert, in connection with that, certain extracts and testimony.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, permission having been granted to me to extend my remarks and to include certain excerpts from the testimony on Cottonseed Trust investigation, the following is submitted:

#### COTTONSEED TRUST INVESTIGATED

The investigation of charges that the cottonseed-oil mills of the South have conspired together for the purpose of setting the price of cottonseed are being investigated by the Federal Trade Commission. The investigation is being conducted by Mr. W. W. Sheppard, examiner, and prosecuted by Mr. Walter Wooden, assisted by other attorneys of the commission. The hearings have not been printed, but under the terms of a resolution passed by the Senate, the hearings will be printed in the near future and can be obtained through the Government Printing Office.

The testimony already introduced clearly sustains most of the charges made against the conspiracy. Although the witnesses heard would be considered defense witnesses, it was necessary, however, for the commission to use these witnesses at the time they did in order to get the proper background of the industry.

#### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE REFUSES TO HELP FARMERS

It will be remembered by those who have been keeping up with the charges I made that from the early part of September, 1929, until the cotton season was over I was in communication frequently with the Department of Justice of the United States. The Hon. John Lord O'Brian, the assistant to the Attorney General, has charge of antitrust prosecutions. I conferred with him frequently by correspondence, by telephone, and personal interviews during the months of September and October. I was insisting that the Department of Justice declare illegal certain resolutions that the representatives of the cottonseed-oil industry had agreed to at Memphis, Tenn., July 24, 1928. I furnished the department with a copy of these resolutions, which showed on their face to contain agreements in violation of the law. If the Department of Justice had acted promptly in declaring these resolutions illegal, the farmers of the South would have saved at least twenty-five or fifty million dollars on their cottonseed. The department refused to advise me, and in a letter from the Hon. John Lord O'Brian to me of date February 24, 1930, he stated:

Please be advised that the acts of Congress provide that the Attorney General shall give opinions only to the President and the heads of executive departments and certain independent government bureaus and that it has been the practice of Attorneys General not to give opinions on inquiries from other sources.

#### CAN NOT ADVISE FARMERS' REPRESENTATIVES, BUT ADVISES WITH TRUST REPRESENTATIVES

The testimony introduced before the Federal Trade Commission June 12, 1930, discloses that Christie Benet, general counsel for the National Cottonseed Products' Association, which is in fact the Cottonseed Trust, was in communication with the Department of Justice. In a letter from Christie Benet, the lawyer for the trust, who had more to do with the organization than any other one man, to the members of the executive committee of the National Cottonseed Products' Association dated November 12, 1929, Mr. Benet stated:

Department of Justice: By appointment President Hodgson; Mr. Asbury, of the executive committee; Mr. Crow, chairman of the refiners' division; Mr. Deupree; Mr. Haines; and I met with Mr. O'Brian at 2 o'clock on Friday. Mr. O'Brian stated that the department was bound by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Maple Flooring and Cement cases, which authorized and approved the interchange of information through a trade association on past and closed transactions, but that the department felt that it was illegal and beyond the law, as interpreted to date, to interchange current market information, as that tended, in their opinion, to create either a price fixation and/or maintenance. In other words, that the bid and offered information could not be legally interchanged through an association. We discussed fully with Mr. O'Brian the position of the industry, both the crude mills under the Memphis resolutions, and the refiners' division under the refiners' code, which had been approved by Colonel Donovan; but he stuck to his position that as the department saw the law

to-day, and until a test case was brought and decided, they could not approve the interchange of current market information.

Before going to Washington I had received telegrams and letters from Mr. O'Brian, in which he stated that the complaints which had been made to the Department from various sections of the belt confirmed the opinion which the department had that the price-reporting plan and the way it had worked out was illegal and that he felt that the department should bring a test case to test the principle of reporting current price information, and pending the decision ask for an injunction to prevent the practice.

#### ILLEGAL COMBINATION KEPT ADVISED BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

It will be noticed from the above that Christie Benet before going to Washington "had received telegrams and letters from Mr. O'Brian." It will be noticed, too, the date of this letter indicates that Mr. O'Brian was conferring with Christie Benet during the time I was conferring with him.

Mr. O'Brian not only refused to help the farmers by breaking up this illegal conspiracy in compliance with my request at a time cottonseed was being marketed but he was advising with the farmers' enemies, the ones who are guilty of violating the antitrust laws.

#### ADVANCE NOTICE GIVEN IF PROSECUTION CONTEMPLATED

December 3, 1929, R. F. Crow, of Houston, Tex., one of the high-ups in the Cottonseed Trust and cottonseed-oil combination, wrote Mr. Christie Benet, P. O. box 188, Columbia, S. C., a letter in which the following is the closing paragraph:

In the opinion Asbury expressed with reference to what Mr. O'Brian is thinking, he has completely changed his views since leaving Washington. Even after reading Asbury's letter I can't get excited. Our course is perfectly clear, namely, submit the code as amended to Mr. O'Brian, tell him briefly the practical developments. If he doesn't like what happens, he will tell us so in plenty of time. No use crossing bridges until you get to them.

It will be noticed that the illegal combination is not afraid of the Department of Justice. In speaking of Mr. O'Brian, who has charge of antitrust matters, in reference to the illegal conduct of the combination, Mr. Crow stated:

If he does not like what happens, he will tell us so in plenty of time.

What I would like to know is, What right has the Department of Justice of the United States to commit itself to advise illegal trusts and combinations in plenty of time when they are violating the laws of the United States?

The letters above referred to are a part of the testimony in the cottonseed investigation.

#### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE SHOULD BE INVESTIGATED

An investigation of the Department of Justice with reference to antitrust matters would disclose some startling conduct on the part of one or more officials of our Government.

#### CONDUCT OF FORMER ATTORNEY GENERAL

I have read the book, *The Strange Death of President Harding*. It contains a confession of Gaston B. Means, who was an employee of the Department of Justice during the administration of Harry M. Daugherty and a special investigator for Mrs. Harding, the wife of the President of the United States. This man's confession should not go unchallenged. If it does, the American people will demand appropriate action. He states that Jess Smith was murdered at the instigation of the Attorney General of the United States in order to prevent the said Jess Smith from disclosing evidence in his possession which would cause the impeachment and conviction of Harry M. Daugherty.

#### PRESENT ATTORNEY GENERAL—DUTY PLAIN

The present Attorney General of the United States is not making any effort, so far as I know, to break up monopolies, trusts, combinations in restraint of trade, and conspiracies which are costing the American people millions of dollars a day. I wonder if the department is going to let go unchallenged or without a thorough investigation and report to the American people the statement that a Cabinet member of the United States Government has caused human life to be taken for the purpose of destroying evidence against this Cabinet official. There is no limitation on a prosecution for murder.

#### MURDER WILL OUT

Gaston B. Means contends that he is in possession of facts to back up every statement that he makes. He discloses a state of facts that show that Jess Smith was murdered in the apartment of Harry Daugherty in the Wardman Park Hotel in the city of Washington, D. C. Therefore witnesses are living who can relate facts and circumstances of a murder. The party who is charged with the murder and the cause of the murder, if Means's statements are true, is now living. The



confession of Means has been widely read by the people of the United States. His disclosures are startling and are calculated to weaken the confidence of the people in the Government of the United States if they go unchallenged and without a satisfactory answer.

#### DAUGHERTY RÉGIME

Means discloses that he was working with Jess Smith in the Department of Justice of the United States during the Daugherty régime. Jess Smith is alleged to have been the bribe taker for the administration. It was also his duty to distribute the money to those who were in on the conspiracy. It is alleged that he collected tens of millions of dollars by using the Department of Justice as an agency for exacting and receiving bribes for Harry M. Daugherty on the sales of paroles, pardons, Federal judgeships, United States district attorney offices, privileges to remove whisky from bonded warehouses, privileges to sell whisky under Federal protection, the exhibition of Dempsey-Carpentier fight-film pictures, disposition of seized property in connection with the violation of Federal laws, and numerous other matters.

#### THE GANG'S HEADQUARTERS

Means claims to have occupied a fashionable home, luxuriously furnished, at 903 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., during the time of his activities, which was considered the undercover executive headquarters for the gang. This building is in close proximity to the White House, the Treasury Department, Department of Justice, and other public buildings. In fact, a person standing on the roof of this building could throw a stone on the top of either the White House, Treasury Department, or Department of Justice without a great deal of effort. There was even a secret passageway which was used from the Department of Justice into the rear of this building. Means claims that they had the rear end of the lot adjacent to this building so arranged that two iron cages had to be gone through, which were securely locked before entrance could be gained into the building; that there was a hole dug in this yard 20 feet deep by Means and his gang, which was used for the purpose of keeping their bribe money until it could be carried to a bank in Ohio under the control of Mal Daugherty, a brother of the Attorney General. It is claimed that they had as much as \$500,000 in this hole at a time and never less than \$50,000. Means, as an agent of the gang, was drawing a salary from the Department of Justice of \$89.33 a week. Jess Smith was paying for him house rent at the rate of \$1,000 a month and providing him with five excellent servants, a five or six thousand dollar Cadillac car with chauffeur, which was always at his disposal day or night.

#### JESS SMITH READY TO SQUEAL

It is said that Jess Smith, being a former department-store clerk and feeling like an accurate account should be kept of all transactions at all times, kept an accurate and detailed account of all the bribe money taken in by him for the benefit of the gang. He made accurate account to all the members of the gang, but kept this detailed statement in writing on his person in a secret belt which fit under his clothing. The gang was being investigated and it is said that Jess Smith was ready to "squeal." For some reason, not exactly known, Harry M. Daugherty, Attorney General of the United States, left his apartment, where he resided with Jess Smith at the Wardman Park Hotel, and remained at the White House a few nights. One of these nights Jess Smith's life was taken in this apartment and Means admits that he was called to that apartment several hours before the death was disclosed, and was by Harry M. Daugherty's agent directed to search the body and take from it these secret papers, which he did and delivered them to Harry M. Daugherty's agent.

#### LIVING WITNESSES

This confession discloses facts, which if true, can be substantiated by living witnesses and corroborated by other testimony.

#### HIGH OFFICIALS BRIBED

It is shocking to read in this confession how money was collected as bribes by high officials of our Government. It is said that the bribe takers would go to hotels and arrange for a place for the bootleggers to come and throw into a glass bowl that was arranged for that purpose bills in denominations of \$500 to \$1,000, never less than \$500. An average of \$250,000 would be collected on each trip to New York and other places in Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.

#### NO ANTITRUST PROSECUTIONS NOW

A short time ago I made the statement that the present Attorney General of the United States is now following in the footsteps of Harry M. Daugherty in so far as his policy toward prosecuting those who are guilty of violating our antitrust laws

is concerned. Daugherty soon after he came into office said that there would be no wholesale indictments obtained, but a test case would be instituted against a typical organization that was charged with operating in restraint of trade. Soon after Mitchell came into office practically the same announcement was made, at least his actions against violation of the antitrust laws are the same. No enforcement from either of them. I do not charge crookedness or corruption on the part of the present Attorney General of the United States.

#### ANTITRUST SUITS DISMISSED

This confession of Means charges that Daugherty dismissed more antitrust cases against large concerns than any other Attorney General of the United States. Daugherty succeeded in satisfying a large group of people who were interested in the enforcement of the prohibition law by pretending to be rigidly enforcing this law. He also claimed that it was necessary to dismiss these antitrust suits in order to make way on the dockets of the courts for Volstead violations.

#### POLICY OF PRESENT ATTORNEY GENERAL

The present Attorney General of the United States seems to be trying to use the old prohibition smoke screen to hide his failure of duty from the American people. He is permitting illegal combinations to thrive by collecting from the people unreasonable and unheard-of profits. Monopoly always exacts the highest price that the people can pay. Monopolies are being permitted to be organized by the Attorney General and set prices. The Attorney General doubtless knows that there is no power on earth to prevent these concerns from charging several times a reasonable price after having any agreement whatever as to prices.

Prohibition has been used as a smoke screen for the last 10 years. The law will never be enforced so long as it is used for that purpose. It looks like now the present Attorney General of the United States, following in the footsteps of Harry Daugherty in this regard, is preparing to use it to hide his failure to enforce the antitrust laws. I believe in the enforcement of the prohibition law, and it is not to the interest of effective prohibition enforcement for prohibition to be used as it is being used—as a smoke screen to hide indefensible acts of an official of our Government.

The antitrust laws and all other laws should be strictly and rigidly enforced.

The policy adopted by the Department of Justice toward monopolies and trusts is wrong. It is destroying independent business. It is making the rich richer and the poor poorer. It is destroying that great middle class—the foundation stone of our Government.

#### MODIFICATION OF THE EIGHTEENTH AMENDMENT

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I have to-day introduced a joint resolution proposing the modification of the eighteenth amendment by an amendment to the eighteenth amendment itself.

I gladly admit that the eighteenth amendment has resulted in much good. It has for example eliminated the saloon which none wishes to see restored. But it has provoked many new evils. The speakeasy and bootlegger now infest the land. The present situation is deplorable. The criminal element has become a well-financed industry due to the swollen profits from the illicit liquor traffic. The problem involved in prohibition has not been solved. With Chairman Wickersham, of the President's Law Enforcement Commission, I do not believe it can be solved by armies of Federal police and more jails. The fine common sense of the American people must and will find a solution that will retain the benefits of present prohibition and at the same time eliminate the brood of evils that the present system has created. It is obvious that the majority of Americans are not satisfied with the present intolerable conditions.

What I said in a public statement in September, 1922, has been fully confirmed by the developments of the past eight years. I quote in part:

The very officers of enforcement unable to withstand the temptations, are in many cases the leaders in the violation of law and corruption. There is everywhere a dangerously increasing contempt for all law. A just common-sense solution of this problem will never be found until the people are willing to face the facts. Prohibition under the Volstead Act is a failure.

The American people do not want the saloon and it should never come back. I am convinced, however, that a great majority of the



American people resent the present Volstead law. Without law and order the Government can not endure. Contempt for the law leads to anarchy. I believe in liberty limited by law, but I am opposed to laws which beget a spirit of lawlessness.

What the eventual solution will be I do not venture to predict. I am confident one will be found. The tolerant majority with clear thinking and common sense will prevail in the end as it always has. As a suggested solution I have introduced a modification of the eighteenth amendment.

My resolution first of all provides for its ratification by specially called conventions rather than by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States. This is in accord with the fifth article of the Constitution. Ratification by conventions will place the issue squarely before the people themselves. It will avoid the possibility of confusing this issue of ratification with other local and State issues.

The resolution modifying the eighteenth amendment then proposes to give to each State by affirmative action the sole right to control and regulate the liquor problem in any way that each State might see fit. It is accomplished by adding two sections to the eighteenth amendment. The present eighteenth amendment would remain in effect for those States that do not take affirmative action. In other words, those States that are satisfied with present conditions would continue to be fully protected by the Federal Government. The States that are not satisfied with present conditions could assume the sole power to regulate the manufacture, sale, or transportation wholly within such State of liquors for beverage purposes. A State would be given the right to remove itself from the provisions of section 1 of the eighteenth amendment. This will restore to those States which wish it the power to determine their own policy toward the liquor traffic. At the same time the Federal Government will continue to have the power to give all possible protection and assistance to those States that desire to continue the attempt for complete prohibition. It is in accord with the American principle of States rights and home rule.

This suggested solution would never result in the return of the saloon as no State taking affirmative action would ever adopt regulations permitting it. No political party would dare to sponsor regulations that would mean the return of the saloon, nor would any single individual. I believe, therefore, that this suggested modification of the eighteenth amendment would result in real temperance, would prevent the return of the saloon, and would eliminate the bootlegger and speakeasy in those States that might decide to take advantage of this provision by affirmative action.

This proposal should not meet opposition in those States which are satisfied with present conditions because they will be protected. On the other hand they should be willing to give States where different conditions prevail the power to work out this most difficult problem in a way that meets with the approval of the peoples in each State.

I do not pretend that this suggested plan is the best solution of the problem. It is offered to stimulate discussion in the hope that it may bring home to all that this question is fundamentally a great constitutional question rather than a moral question. Prohibition is a question of polity; temperance is a question of individual morality.

Of course, it can not be denied that it is contrary to the spirit, traditions, and fundamental purpose of our Constitution to write into it what amounts to a police statute. The repeal of the eighteenth amendment alone will cure this error.

However, to meet the opinion of millions of earnest Americans who seek a solution that will safeguard those States which still wish to aim at complete prohibition, I have suggested this modification of the eighteenth amendment which I have been working on since last January. It will at least give the people of a State the sovereign right to regulate their own problems and it will permit them to resume the police powers originally reserved to them in our Constitution.

Those who do not believe in State rights and home rule and have no faith in the people of each State and their ability to regulate their own social problems and welfare will, of course, be opposed to the suggested plan.

The text of the resolution follows:

[H. J. Res. 387, 71st Cong., 2d sess.]

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to amend the eighteenth amendment.

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in three-fourths of the several States:*

LXXII—748

That Article XVIII is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 4. Any State or Territory may, by law thereof enacted after the ratification of this section, provide that the prohibition contained in section 1 of this article shall not apply to the manufacture, sale, or transportation wholly within such State or Territory of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes, and thereafter such State or Territory shall have the sole power to regulate the manufacture, sale, or transportation of such liquors wholly within such State or Territory.

"SEC. 5. Congress may, by law enacted after the ratification of this section, provide that the prohibition contained in section 1 of this article shall not apply to the manufacture, sale, or transportation wholly within a place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States (other than a State or Territory) of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes."

"SEC. 6. Congress shall have power, by law enacted after the ratification of this section, to regulate the importation of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes from any foreign country, or from a State or Territory, into any State or Territory which, under the provisions of section 4 of this article, provides that the prohibition contained in section 1 of this article shall not apply in such State or Territory."

#### UNITED STATES BORDER PATROL

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 254.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House Resolution 254

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 11204, a bill to regulate the entry of persons into the United States, to establish a border patrol in the Coast Guard, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman make some agreement as to the time under the rule?

Mr. MICHENER. I was going to ask the gentleman in regard to that.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. We shall need at least half an hour.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, this is the usual rule, to make in order the bill H. R. 11204, which is commonly known as the border patrol bill.

The purpose of this measure is to establish a unified patrol service along the land borders of the United States, to make more effective the laws against unlawful entry of persons and property, and at the same time to serve the convenience of those lawfully crossing the borders.

The establishment of this unified patrol service was recommended by the President in his message to Congress at the opening of the present session, and is earnestly favored by all the departments involved. The bill has been carefully considered by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

When the House considers it in detail the bill will be thoroughly explained, and I shall take up no more time now in explaining the bill, inasmuch as we are at this time considering the rule making the bill in order.

Mr. HASTINGS. Do you hope to get the bill into the Committee of the Whole to-morrow?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes. We do hope to get it in Committee of the Whole to-day.

Mr. HASTINGS. To-morrow is Private Calendar day.

Mr. MICHENER. To-morrow is the Private Calendar day, and this bill will be privileged. It will be up to the Speaker to determine which course he will pursue in regard to it, whether we continue with this bill or take up the Private Calendar.

Mr. PATTERSON. We would like to know what the program is going to be.

Mr. HASTINGS. That is why I made the inquiry, whether this bill would be taken up to-morrow.

Mr. MICHENER. I believe we will be able to take it up to-morrow.

Mr. TILSON. It will be considered the unfinished business to-morrow.



Mr. STAFFORD. Is it the intention to go into Committee of the Whole on that bill this evening?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; under general debate.

Mr. STAFFORD. How far is it proposed to go with the general debate?

Mr. MICHENER. As long as the committee will permit. It is the purpose to go into Committee of the Whole but perhaps we can not finish the general debate to-night.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I will ask the Speaker to advise me when I have used 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in the few remarks which I made this morning in connection with the veterans' bill I mentioned the fact that this bill for the establishment of a border patrol was one of the important bills still pending in this House. I am glad it has not been brought out under suspension of the rules but is now brought out under a rule from the Committee on Rules so that it can be properly considered and amended.

This bill is a distinct departure in dealing with our boundaries, on the north, of 2,839 miles, excluding the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River of over 665 miles, and our Mexican border on the south of 1,677 miles.

For over a century we have boasted of our neutrality along those borders. We have told the world that we had no forts nor fortifications between us and our two neighbors, that we have had no armed force patrolling those borders that might possibly disrupt international amity. That was a proud boast and a laudible relationship between neighboring nations.

Now, for the first time in 116 years, it is proposed that we place an armed and uniformed force along those borders under the guise of controlling immigration, prohibition, and customs. Let us in calmness consider the need for such an extraordinary departure from our traditions.

This bill was introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HUDSON], one of the "dry" leaders of this House and an admitted sympathizer of the Anti-Saloon League. It was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Why, you may ask? Because the original bill proposed to make this border patrol a part of the Coast Guard, which is part of our Army and over which that committee has jurisdiction.

One might well wonder why it was not sent to the Committee on Immigration, if its chief purpose was to apprehend smuggled aliens. That committee was working on the problem as far as immigration was concerned, nor was it referred to the Ways and Means Committee which has jurisdiction of customs. The chief objection to this bill is that it creates a new crime under our Federal law, the principal and most objectionable feature of the bill being its criminal section, section 4, which provides it shall be unlawful for any person to enter the United States from a foreign country at any place other than a point of entry which shall be designated by the President, except, and so forth. I particularly call the attention of the lawyers of this House to that provision. I do not object to protecting our borders against the unlawful entry of persons or merchandise. I am not opposed to the consolidation of the different forces who watch for customs smugglers or prohibition smugglers or aliens trying to enter our country in violation of our immigration laws. I am not opposed to reasonable provisions to meet these conditions, but I am opposed to the vicious features of the bill which make a new crime, a crime which any American citizen or any child might commit, innocently, unknowingly, not willfully, and yet be branded as a criminal for life without any possibility of removing the stain of that criminal record.

I wonder what the Committee on the Judiciary would think of such a proposal if the bill had been referred to that committee. This language of the bill which I have quoted to you, specifically and unequivocally makes a criminal of any person who enters the United States across its northern or its southern border without first going to a point of entry, to be designated by the President. The bill does not say he must do it willfully or knowingly, but it provides that if he puts one foot over the border except at a point of entry, he is guilty of a crime, whether he knows where the border is or does it accidentally with no intent to evade our laws. If an American boy swims out in a boundary river across this imaginary boundary, and then swims back without reporting, possibly a hundred miles away at a point of entry, he is guilty of a crime and always will have that crime on his record. If an American boy or girl skates or paddles across the middle of the Detroit River and then comes back into the United States without first reporting at a point of entry, possibly a hundred miles away, he or she is forever branded as a criminal. If an American citizen is hunting in Canada and unknowingly puts his foot across the border at a spot other than a point of entry, not knowing even

that he is back in the United States, he is proven guilty of a crime. He has no defense to the charge. The mere unconscious false step has made him guilty of a crime, and he is branded a criminal for the rest of his life. There is no mitigation of the offense—lack of intent or knowledge can not be pleaded. What would our great Judiciary Committee do with a bill like that if it were before them?

Now, what prompts the bill? It is an attempt to meet the prohibition situation, and that situation alone, on our northern and southern borders. It does not pertain to our ocean borders at all. But, to meet the prohibition situation alone, a new crime, with no intent involved, with no knowledge of wrongdoing involved, there may be placed upon our statute books such a law as this, unheard of in our criminal jurisprudence. It will affect thousands and hundreds of thousands of American citizens. It is true that within the last few days some amendments have been made with reference to the passage of small boats across our boundary waters, so great was the protest from boat associations and owners that when this bill first was reported, it repealed the navigation laws of 1912, which protected small boats from having to report at a port of entry. It repealed two sections of the tariff law which had just become a law, by rescinding the exemptions granted to small pleasure boats. In the past few days the proponents of the bill have been trying to work out some change in these harsh provisions to meet the thousands of protests against the bill. Has the Anti-Saloon League sat in their conferences? It is commonly reported that all changes have had to meet the wishes of that supergovernment of Washington.

New York State has 665 miles of a water boundary with Canada through the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes. Lake Erie is about 115 miles long, Lake Ontario about 303 miles, and the St. Lawrence River about 247 miles. It has about 74 miles of land boundary.

Now, gentlemen, let us be fair. Whenever the prohibition question is raised, some people see red. All their judgment as lawyers, as legislators, as sportsmen, seems to leave them, and they become unduly harsh and vindictive. Let us be fair about it.

This law would create a crime where there is absolutely no criminal intent. The immigration authorities admit they do not need this consolidation to meet the situation. At the hearings the immigration authorities stated—page 60—that they were controlling the situation very well. Last year they apprehended, with a force of about 847 men, 29,568 aliens attempting to cross the border illegally and 291 smugglers of aliens. They confiscated 741 automobiles and 222 other vehicles with a small force of inspectors admittedly adequate for their purposes. And, mark you, gentlemen, this same immigration force confiscated 352,869 gallons of liquor. The combined forces of immigration, prohibition, and customs, consisting of about 1,500 men, seized last year, and, of course, destroyed, 1,043,366 gallons of liquor, 3,902 autos, and 1,223 boats.

The Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Ogden L. Mills, testified before the committee, as follows:

If you want to consider this—and I am not suggesting that you should—but if you want us to consider this as a prohibition problem or primarily a prohibition problem, remember that we are spending about \$15,000,000 on prohibition proper in the United States. I think Governor Lowman and Admiral Billard will tell you certainly not more than 3 or 4 per cent—you will correct me if I am wrong—of the liquor consumed in the United States is probably imported liquor.

Mr. LOWMAN. That is the estimate, 3 or 4 per cent.

Mr. MILLS. Say that it is 5 per cent. Is it logical to spend \$15,000,000 trying to prevent the sale of 95 per cent of the liquor consumed and \$15,000,000 on the land borders and \$22,000,000 on the ocean to prevent the importation of the 2½ or 3 per cent or 4 or 5 per cent, as a business proposition?

The balance of 97 per cent is, of course, manufactured in this country. Since Canada has placed an embargo on exportation of liquors, it is estimated that not more than one-half of 1 per cent is imported. The 1,000,000 gallons of liquor which was confiscated last year represents 3 per cent of the entire consumption of liquor in this country. Now it is proposed to spend upward of \$4,000,000 under the guise of consolidation of the border patrols to seize what little more there is being smuggled into this country.

Time and again during this session of Congress we have, at the behest of the President, the Director of the Budget, and the leaders, refused to enact necessary legislation affecting our citizens because it would entail the expenditure of one or two millions of dollars. Now we propose to throw away another \$5,000,000 in attempting to enforce an unenforceable law.

Under this bill it is proposed to have the President establish what are known as "points of entry." At the utmost there will



not be over 250 on the northern border of 3,500 miles and not over 100 on our southern boundary of nearly 1,700 miles. In some instances these points of entry will be 100 miles apart, yet every person, American citizen or not, coming into this country must come in through a point of entry or be guilty of a crime. The President will establish the points of entry as he chooses, and anybody coming into this country except at those points of entry will be arrested, confined, and branded a criminal, even though there was no intent to evade any law of the United States.

When the bill shall be read for amendment I propose to offer an amendment to section 4 of the bill by inserting, in line 14, of page 7, after the word "person," the words "knowingly and willfully," and in line 17, on page 7, after the word "President," the words "with intent to evade or violate the laws of the United States." Those amendments should be acceptable to any lawyer or to any fair-minded person.

The Members of Congress from New York are particularly shocked that the responsibility for this bill rests chiefly on the shoulders of four Republicans from New York. It might well be known as the Mills-Lowman-Parker-Snell bill. Mr. Ogden L. Mills, undersecretary of the Treasury, advocated it; Mr. Lowman, of the Treasury Department, formerly lieutenant governor of New York, advocated it; it went through and was reported from the committee headed by the gentleman from New York, Mr. PARKER, and the Rules Committee, headed by the gentleman from New York, Mr. SNELL, whose district is affected more than any other portion of the country, brought it on the floor. Four sons of New York, Mills, Lowman, PARKER, and SNELL, forgetting the interests of their own State, are more responsible for this legislation, which affects the northern boundary of the State of New York, than any other four men. The Anti-Saloon League may have originated the idea but they are responsible for its being before us.

It is not so long ago that the Rev. Dr. "True" Wilson, that unprejudiced, that unbogoted exponent of tolerance and truth, proposed that we stand the marines on the Canadian border shoulder to shoulder, with cocked rifles in hand. Mr. Lowman, as usual, subservient to Wilson and his buddies, Cannon and McBride, wanted to submit to the suggestion but only went so far as to arm the border patrol with machine guns and sawed-off shotguns. The result was outrageous assault and death to many innocent citizens. President Hoover, a man of some discernment as to the patience of our people, called in Mr. Lowman and said, "Stop that; just give those guerrillas pistols and clubs." Mr. Lowman replied, "Why Mr. President, I would build a barbed-wire fence 20 feet high along that Canadian border." That was about the limit, for Mr. Hoover then said to Mr. Lowman, "If you ever make another suggestion like that just look for another job—we have been too friendly with Canada for 116 years to build any fence along that border." And Mr. Lowman had to call in the best Republican minds in New York to hold his job.

Failing in that fanatical attempt to get at the enforcement of this one law—the prohibition law—the fanatics now present this bill. It builds a fence more repugnant than any barbed-wire structure, because it interferes with the rights of our own citizens.

Let me read to you what the American Federation of Labor thinks of the bill. That organization is for immigration restriction. There is nobody in this United States more favorable to the restriction of immigration than the American Federation of Labor. Were they deceived into believing that this was an immigration bill? They were not. Here is what Mr. Roberts, their representative, said in the hearing:

We are opposed to this unified border patrol because we fear it has only one purpose, to enforce one law. We have fought for years to get a border patrol to protect us from an influx of immigration, without avail, but now we consider that the whole purpose of this bill is just merely to have another border patrol to enforce the prohibition act, and I think the immigration act is just as important, if not more so.

The immigration officials said they had the situation well in hand. I believe the Customs Department expressed no desire for this legislation. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. GARBER] asked Mr. Frank Dow, Assistant Commissioner, Bureau of Customs of the Treasury Department, this question (p. 58 of the hearings):

Has your force been sufficient to efficiently patrol for customs requirement?

Mr. Dow replied:

I think we have done a pretty good job.

The Customs Bureau testified it did not need any more help. The Immigration Service testified it did not need any more help, but the pressure behind this bill, the same old pressure

that was behind the Jones law, which proved to be such a fiasco, even in this House, was too great to prevent its presentation.

There is the same pressure behind this bill, and the desire is to pass it just for the one purpose, namely, that of getting a few more gallons of the 3 per cent of liquor that comes into this country. I do not object to that so much, but in doing it you are going to make criminals of hundreds of thousands of American citizens.

The immigration authorities testified they were controlling the situation. They testified they are already moving to the border; that they are putting their buildings on the border and only needed a few more men. But what does the bill do? It does not state how many men will be used. It does not limit the number of men that may be used to arrest American citizens. The proponents guess that they are going to increase the number from about 1,500 to 2,500; but you know what is going to happen. It always does happen. The 2,500 men may be increased to 25,000, and the hope and the dream of the Reverend Doctor Wilson may come true, and we may really have uniformed men standing shoulder to shoulder along the Canadian and the Mexican borders engaged not only in keeping out the foreigner but keeping out an American citizen from returning to his own country.

Let me read to you what a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee said about this bill, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MILLIGAN], and he was astounded to find that this bill makes a man a criminal who has no willful intent and who is not trying to evade our laws. Mr. Alvord, counsel to the Treasury Department, was testifying:

Mr. MILLIGAN. Is not that very unusual, section b on page 2? You arrest a man for a misdemeanor, and then you try him for an entirely different crime?

Mr. ALVORD. That probably is not unusual. Persons are frequently arrested for one offense and by the time they are ready for trial or for commitment they decide to change the offense.

Mr. MILLIGAN. You arrest him not with the intention of trying him for that offense. You arrest him merely to take him into custody so that you can try him for some other offense?

Mr. ALVORD. That I think is right.

Mr. MILLIGAN. Is not that rather unusual?

Mr. ALVORD. It may be somewhat unusual.

Mr. MILLIGAN. Suppose you arrest a man and then he would sue out a writ of habeas corpus?

Mr. ALVORD. I doubt if the writ of habeas corpus would lie, because he was lawfully arrested.

Mr. MILLIGAN. He can sue out a writ of habeas corpus in any case, whether he is guilty or innocent?

Mr. ALVORD. That is true.

Mr. MILLIGAN. He sues out his writ, and then you contend that he has violated this section because he did not go to a certain point. Then you take him back and try him for an entirely different crime?

Mr. ALVORD. Of course, you can try him for this.

Mr. MILLIGAN. But that is not the intention.

Mr. ALVORD. And that would be the issue on the petition for the writ.

Mr. MILLIGAN. Certainly it would be the issue that he has violated this provision, but the real intention is to try him on an entirely different offense. Is that true?

Mr. ALVORD. That is true. As I see this thing, the real purpose of it is to try him for some other offense. If he has really committed a serious offense against the customs or the immigration, he should be tried for that, and if he has not he ought not to be tried for this, I would say.

Mr. MILLIGAN. The real intention in arresting him is to investigate.

Mr. ALVORD. That is it.

Mr. MILLIGAN. Is there any other law with a similar section in it?

Mr. ALVORD. I do not know of any; no, sir. We had to scratch our head to concoct a means of getting ample power there. I think this does it.

The disorder now in this Chamber represents the difficulty a Member has when he attempts to discuss any question even remotely involving prohibition. It is difficult for Members otherwise fair to be courteous in their attention if they espouse the prohibition cause. I regret it; but in this instance I am talking to you about the legal rights of citizens, American citizens. Under this bill an American citizen who steps one foot into his own country other than at a point of entry is forever branded as a criminal. He may have no goods or merchandise on him, not even a suitcase, yet because he did not enter his own country at a point of entry, probably 100 miles distant, he is arrested, locked up, and becomes a criminal. The patrolman has no discretion in the matter. The act itself, however innocent, constitutes the crime, with no defense. Is that American law?



No one would suggest such a provision in connection with any law other than the sanctified prohibition law.

It is the method that was used for years in Russia and other countries. The ability to arrest on some pretext and then determine if some crime had been committed—Soviet Russia does it to-day. By this bill we go Soviet Russia one better. They may amend the original bill in reference to small boats and as to people who live near the border or own property there. The President is going to issue permits to them to pass and repass at will. But millions do not live near the border or own property there who occasionally cross the border and will be subject to arrest. The permit—the registration system—is with us at last, the registration of American citizens. That is the old Russian system. Anyone who has not a card can be locked up overnight, and even if he later proves his innocent intentions he is still just as much a criminal as ever. He is made a criminal the moment he steps over the border, innocently or otherwise.

I can not see how anybody, even those favoring prohibition, can go that far. I believe it is the most outrageous step in violation of American jurisprudence that has ever been taken in our history. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLANCY].

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, it has always been my strict rule throughout life never to make a misstatement intentionally, and to correct immediately one made by me when I detect it. I particularly regret a misstatement when it does not correctly report the statements or record of an individual.

I hasten to correct an error made by me in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 25, 1930. I said that it was Dr. Clarence True Wilson who advocated "calling out the Marines" to patrol the border on prohibition and establish martial law. I referred to his article in Collier's Weekly of July 13, 1929.

I tried hard to get this article before I prepared my manuscript for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but the Congressional Library informed me the copy in question of Collier's Weekly had been sent to the bindery. I asked them to get it, and later they did, after my statement was in the RECORD.

I find that Dr. Clarence True Wilson declared for martial law and the "calling out of the marines," but he wanted them to punish the States of New York and Maryland, which he declared were "in rebellion" because they had voted against a State prohibition law. I did him no injustice in advocating thus the abrogation of the "bill of rights" of the United States Constitution in those States, and the abrogation of the writ of habeas corpus and installing trials by court-martial instead of the courts of land.

He also advocated that first offenders be given a very severe sentence and the buyer of liquor be savagely punished. So I did no damage in setting him forth as a fanatic; but it is true that he just did not happen to think of the Detroit border in his outbreak or he undoubtedly would have thrown the Detroit border in with New York and Maryland. I recall that some Anti-Saloon League advocate urged martial law on the Detroit border, but I can not remember his name nor the occasion.

Mr. Speaker, ladies, and gentlemen, I do not like to trespass upon the time and attention of the House unless I am quite informed on the question at issue. For four years I enforced, as secretary to the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, the navigation laws of the United States in the Department of Commerce, and a normal day's business was about 100 violations of the Federal navigation laws; and for five and a half years I was the United States customs appraiser of Michigan on the border, handling the customs laws; and for two years during the Great War I was manager of the United States War Trade Board for that portion of the border and for several States.

So I do know navigation and customs laws as an expert. I do know about these barriers, wise and unwise, that are placed upon the border for the regulation of persons and merchandise in border traffic. I say to you that this bill that is now before you is one of the most sensational and vicious bills that has been placed before you during this Congress, and one of the most important.

This bill does the unheard-of thing of breaking the relations with our northern neighbor, Canada, that have existed for 116 years, or since 1814. It closes the border against Canada, and it does the same thing for our great neighbor on the south, Mexico; the relations existing since 1847 or 1848.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] has discussed the question on the St. Lawrence River, Niagara River, and Lakes Erie and Ontario, and on the northern land border of about 75 miles in New York; and I may say to you that there are the makings of a red-hot political situation in New York if you put this bill on New York with that State so close in

elections. Many New Yorkers will bitterly resent this measure if enacted into law.

The same serious restrictions will exist on the entire 1,500 miles of the Texas border, which is on the Rio Grande. The leader on the other side, the very estimable gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], whom I admire, has about 560 miles of that border in his district.

They have whispered around that I am satisfied with the amendment that will be offered to protect small boats, which are now protected under present law by the navigation law of 1912, R. S. 4218, and two sections of the recent tariff law. The two Committees of the House and Senate, Ways and Means and Finance, carefully considered these two sections. So did the House and Senate for 18 months. The President signed this tariff bill the other day, and we all found these two small boat sections to be wise laws. I do not think there was anybody on the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce or on the Rules Committee who understood that this Hudson bill endangered these three aforesaid laws.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] demonstrated, in part, there is no necessity for this legislation. Undersecretary of the Treasury Ogden Mills was liberal enough to say before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee that we are spending \$37,000,000 per year to catch the 3 or 4 per cent of the liquor coming in over the Pacific, Atlantic, Canadian, and Mexican borders and \$15,000,000 per year to catch the 95 per cent of liquor manufactured in the United States; but since that testimony Canada has placed a strict embargo on the exportation of liquor to the United States, and the Canadian border agents and their Northwest Mounted Police are far more honest and efficient than our border agents. The Canadian Minister of Marine said formerly Canada was exporting 2 per cent of the American supply. I say now it is less than one-half of 1 per cent.

So at this time, when we are talking about the desperate condition of the Budget and an increase of Federal taxes, and when we can not afford appropriating any more money, you are asking for \$4,241,799 more per year for greedy prohibition. You ask at the first crack an increase of \$5,097,679 for the first two years of this new border bill. You are already spending \$52,000,000 per year for prohibition enforcement. Here you are pouring \$4,000,000 more annually after two years into this sewer to catch one-half of 1 per cent of the liquor imported into the United States!

This is a prohibition bill. It is an Anti-Saloon League bill. That is the driving force behind it. This bill is mean. It even makes the innocent passage of children across any part of this land border a crime unless they go a long distance, in most cases, and report the innocent transaction to a border or customs agent. Formerly they never had to do this. That is the vicious bill you have before you now. Mr. Wickersham admitted the other day that the trouble is we are making too many new crimes and too many excessive punishments.

When we opened the international bridge in Detroit several months ago and the bridge at Buffalo some time before that, all the orators, Canadian and American statesmen, felicitated the two nations that we have lived in peace and amity for 116 years and that we passed back and forth practically the same as American people between two American States.

Now, here in this measure you have outraged this good neighbor. You have already made them angry by the tariff bill, and they are threatening to cut down our exports, which have been \$900,000,000 a year, by one-third, or \$300,000,000 a year. Now you rub them the wrong way by this bill. You give them a slap in the face.

Fortunately some wise Senators say that this bill will get a full and fair hearing in the Senate, and they will learn just what the bill means. That will be a godsend.

What are these all-important regulations proposed by the Treasury Department to take the place of the "good old days"?

#### LAWS AND REGULATIONS

I have no doubt that the Anti-Saloon League has enough power to put it through the House. But there is a great chain of newspapers which is going to show up this vicious measure before the Senate acts next December. The people will be advised quite fully.

I am now going into the question of the land border. Later I will take up the water-border discussion.

Jackman, Me., town is on the border, partly in Canada and partly in United States, as is Denby Line, Vt., Nogales, Ariz., and also three towns in Minnesota, so that if children cross the street, automatically by this bill they become criminals. If a child crosses the border chasing a dog or going after the cattle he automatically becomes a criminal. That has never been a crime in the past.



There is a house up in New England where the wife's bedroom is in Canada and the husband's bedroom is in the United States.

There are many houses and farms that lie on the border line. There are stores lying in both countries. There are houses where the kitchen is in one country and the other part of the house in the other country. The man who pursues his ordinary vocation about such farm would violate this law. The only remedy is for them to register, to undergo a police quiz and get permits or passports.

Now, the sponsors of this bill say that it does not mean compulsory or voluntary registration. They know that is odious to the American people, who immediately think of Russian terrorism. We have seen how it works in Russia, where secret police swarm, and everybody is checked and double checked. The American Federation of Labor, in its convention in 1925, through that great leader, Sam Gompers, said in resolutions that it opposed alien registration because it would eventually mean American registration. You never could force alien registration through Congress, but now you force far worse.

Now you are providing for compulsory registration, for all citizens on the line or border. These fellows up in the Treasury Department know that it will be utterly impossible to enforce this measure to any degree. But they are merely being forced to recommend another bad prohibition law. Why, up at Jackman Me., father will have to take the little kiddies in his wagon or auto and travel way back a hundred miles and say to the new Federal force: "We are not criminals, we want to register; give us a permit or a passport," for that is what it is. The distance between Jackman, Me., and the next point of entry is 195 miles. Think of it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLANCY. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Under the bill only people residing near the border can get a permit.

Mr. CLANCY. Yes; I am glad the gentleman made that point. The person living away from the border is out in the cold. This law operates very harshly on him.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, the rule before us is fair. It will give the House a chance to consider the bill that it makes in order under the 5-minute rule. Therefore I am not opposed to its being adopted, but the bill that it makes in order is vicious.

For the purpose of efficiency and economy I have advocated for years the unification of many of our bureaus. The prohibition gentlemen who are advocating this bill did not appeal to the Immigration Committee, which is familiar with the conditions of immigration, nor did they appeal to the Committee on the Judiciary, which is familiar with the laws relating to prohibition. They ignored both of these committees that are familiar with conditions and turned to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which to my mind has had very little experience with or knowledge of conditions on our borders.

I think it is unfair and unjustified that a committee should assume jurisdiction in this matter when the subject is being considered by committees having jurisdiction and knowledge of the subject matter. Surely no one will question the fact that the Immigration Committee is a working committee, or that it is efficient, or that it does try to prevent smuggling over the borders.

The Immigration Committee is so restrictive in its efforts and actions that surely the House does not need to fear that it will not do its full duty to protect the country from any bootlegging over the Canadian or Mexican borders. I believe that that committee, if it had been given time, would have brought in a bill that would be fair and just; a bill which would not be as vicious as this bill.

Let me call your attention to section 4 of the bill. It provides that it shall be unlawful for any person to enter the United States from a foreign country at any place other than a point of entry which shall be designated by the President. There are thousands of miles of our border. The President is going to designate the points of entry, and if, by any chance, an automobile or a traveler or an airplane should come into the United States across the border outside of the designated spot they will be guilty, under the bill, of a misdemeanor and subject to fine and imprisonment. It is manifestly unfair and unjustifiable.

Let us read section 5 and see the intent of the gentlemen who are behind this legislation. Section 5 provides that there are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary

to carry out the provisions of the act and for the establishment and maintenance of points of entry designated under the act. Under that provision millions of dollars will be appropriated trying to enforce the prohibition law, which can not be enforced.

I feel that people are sick and tired of being forced to pay these tremendous expenditures and the ever-increasing taxes due to prohibition. Let us repeal that law and reduce the burden.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER].

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those Members of the House who believe in nondiscriminating restrictive immigration laws and the protective tariff in order to protect industry and labor of America from unfair competition with cheaply produced foreign products, be they liquor or any other product. I believe this bill is a step in the right direction to assist in the relief of the unemployment situation. This bill when enacted will materially assist in keeping out aliens who each day are being bootlegged into the country. Just last week I received a letter from an alien who asked me to go to the Commissioner of Immigration to stay his deportation warrant until such time as he and his family had an opportunity to earn sufficient wages to pay the transportation charges to his native land. He admitted that his family, consisting of himself, wife, and 18-year-old daughter, had recently entered this country in violation of the immigration laws, and stated in his letter that a few months more in this country would enable him to pay the transportation, as he was employed in these days of unemployment, as well as his wife and 18-year-old child. The border patrol as provided in the pending bill will greatly assist in effectively enforcing the immigration laws, prevent the bootlegging of aliens, and thereby prevent our American citizens and aliens legally in our country from walking the streets unemployed while aliens who enter in violation of law are employed.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. It appears that this bill transfers the present border patrol that has for its purpose the exclusion of aliens to the exclusion of the importation of liquor. Therefore, the efficiency of keeping the immigrants out at the present time will be diverted to another purpose, which will permit the alien to come in.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I do not agree with my colleague. He is clearly laboring under a misapprehension. You could, under the same premises, reach a conclusion that the passage of this bill will transfer some of the activities in enforcing the prohibition and customs laws to enforcing the immigration laws. When you have three independent agencies having jurisdiction over three different laws—the customs laws, the immigration laws, and the prohibition laws—with a certain number of personnel, you are going to be able to more efficiently enforce all of the laws if the agencies are consolidated and the personnel enforces the three laws and not one particular law, be it prohibition, immigration, or customs. As far as prohibition is concerned I yield to no man, from Wisconsin or any other State, in my opposition thereto. However, if it comes to the question of consuming liquor illegally in this country, I want to state that as between the liquor manufactured from the American farmers' grain by Americans and that manufactured from the grain of foreign farmers by aliens without the United States, I will gladly take my position in favor of the American farmer and producer.

The pending bill is in the interest of labor, is in the interest of the farmer, and in the interest of economy, and I sincerely hope that some of my good friends who are opposed to the sumptuary prohibition laws will discontinue their attempt to misrepresent it. If you honestly approach the bill from the prohibition standpoint alone, I ask you to stand by the American industry as against the Canadian and other foreign bootleggers handling wet goods produced from grain grown by farmers in foreign lands. [Applause.]

Mr. DICKSTEIN. In other words, to protect your district from foreign competition.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOCH].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to discuss all these matters at this time. They will be fully discussed and considered in the general debate on the bill.

I simply want to make reference to one or two things that have just been mentioned in the debate. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] seemed to be disturbed at the idea of putting a uniformed and armed force on the Canadian border. Evidently the gentleman does not already know it, but I can



assure him that we have had just such a patrol ever since 1924. The immigration patrol men are uniformed and armed, and those in the Customs Service are uniformed and armed, and this bill proposes no change whatever in that situation.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. The first objection that was set up against the organization of the Coast Guard was that it should be kept out of the Army.

Mr. HOCH. The gentleman, if he is discussing the Coast Guard proposition, is discussing something that is not in the bill. The gentleman indicated plainly that we were establishing for the first time a uniformed and armed service along the two borders. These services will be no more armed and no more uniformed than are the present services. Both of them are now uniformed and armed. They are under civil service. It is true that we shall have a few more men in uniform, but they will be no different in character, and more are needed to enforce the laws of this country.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Is it not true that for the first time you have what is called patrolmen?

Mr. HOCH. No; that is not true.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. The purpose of this bill, according to the hearings, is to put them all in uniform.

Mr. HOCH. We have patrolmen now in uniformed service. They are patrolmen, so named in the law and in the administration of the law.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. The customs patrol is an armed patrol, is it?

Mr. HOCH. It is. If the gentleman is alarmed by calling them patrolmen, he can get all the satisfaction out of that that he wants, but it will be in no particular different from the service at the present time.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. HOCH. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. I understand that the Customs Service and the Immigration Service are now exactly as they will be under this bill?

Mr. HOCH. Yes. As far as the administrative officers are concerned. They will be in the same service as they are now. The patrolmen now in the Customs Service and in the Immigration Service will simply be transferred to this one unified patrol, and the patrolmen will not be concerned under this bill primarily with customs and immigration matters, or any other laws, but they will patrol the border and if they find a person coming unlawfully over the border they will intercept him.

Mr. SNELL. Is it going to make it more difficult for people to go between the United States and Canada?

Mr. HOCH. No.

The gentleman from Chicago [Mr. SABATH] also was alarmed about something. What was the cause of his alarm? He said that if a man came across the border under this bill in an automobile at other than a point of entry he would be subject to arrest.

Mr. SNELL. If a man comes across the border, he must come through a customs port of entry?

Mr. HOCH. At a point of entry, with certain exceptions, as will be explained during the debate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. HOCH. If he comes across in an automobile, even though an American citizen, he must, under the present law, report at a customs port. In many cases the customs port is several miles back of the border. In one case, in Montana, it is many miles back of the border. Instead of adding to the inconvenience of the people coming across the border under these circumstances it will add to their convenience, because the present tentative proposals contemplate having 325 points of entry instead of 150, or 175 more, along the Canadian border. Under the new law the person who comes across the border will not be subject to the inconvenience of going many miles to report at a customs port.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. A man can come over on foot without baggage now, but under this law he can not come over on foot without baggage?

Mr. HOCH. The gentleman has now abandoned the automobile proposition?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Oh, I never claimed that.

Mr. HOCH. Now, under the present law, the only American citizen who is not required to report at the customs port is the man on foot who brings no merchandise of any sort with him. The Customs Service inform me that, technically, if a man brings two soiled handkerchiefs in his pocket he is a violator of the law unless he reports at the customs port of entry.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Well, under the new law—  
Mr. HOCH. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLANCY] spoke with reference to the boats—

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Why does the gentleman not keep to the man on foot before he goes to the boats?

Mr. HOCH. In order that there may be no uncertainty, we intend to offer an amendment to make perfectly clear what was all the time the purpose of the language so that the status of one who comes across in a small boat, defined in the tariff act as a boat of 5 net tons and less, will not be changed in any particular by this bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Why does the gentleman not say that the man who comes across on foot, even without two soiled handkerchiefs, under this bill is guilty of a crime? Isn't that the fact?

Mr. HOCH. No; except with qualifications, it is not the fact.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Will the gentleman answer that question? I have asked the gentleman three times. In the Committee on Rules the gentleman said it was, and everybody understood it. Everybody understood that under this bill if a man walked across the border with nothing, he commits a crime.

Mr. HOCH. If the gentleman will give me a chance, I will answer his question. If the gentleman will refer to the provision on page 7, paragraph 4, subsection 1, he will find there is an intention there to provide, under the regulations, that those who live near the border or who own property do not have to report.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I do not live near the border. I do not own property. Suppose I am up in Canada hunting and I step across the boundary with nothing, am I not guilty of a crime, ipso facto?

Mr. HOCH. Yes; technically, but only under circumstances which will be fully explained.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Now, the gentleman has answered the question.

Mr. HOCH. Under the present law the gentleman is guilty of a crime if he comes across with a couple of soiled handkerchiefs, unless he reports to customs.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. But suppose I have not got them?

Mr. STAFFORD. Suppose he has only a soiled shirt?

Mr. CLANCY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOCH. I yield.

Mr. CLANCY. I agree with the gentleman that the law now is that automobiles and aircraft must report. But men, women, and children, millions and millions, using the border need not report. The pedestrian and small-boat owner need not report if not getting merchandise abroad. The gentleman does not need to mention any technicalities about soiled handkerchiefs.

Mr. HOCH. Is it not true that if they bring in merchandise of any sort they must report?

Mr. CLANCY. If they purchase merchandise abroad; yes.

Mr. HOCH. No. The law does not provide that they shall purchase the merchandise abroad.

Mr. CLANCY. Purchase or obtain it. If they catch fish abroad they should report it, but nobody enforces that technicality.

Mr. HOCH. No matter how far away the customs port is, they must go there and report.

Mr. CLANCY. Now the gentleman brings up the question of small boats. The gentleman says the letter he has received from Secretary Mellon answers my objection. I fear that is not true.

Mr. HOCH. The gentleman does not mean to question my statement about it?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas five additional minutes.

Mr. CLANCY. There is some apparently slippery language in the letter possibly not placed there intentionally, but I will tell the gentleman what the crux of that is. I fear "weasel words" and I will ask for a full interpretation.

Mr. HOCH. I think I know what the crux of the proposition is.

Mr. CLANCY. If the gentleman does, then the gentleman is not telling me the full truth when he says that motor boats are fully exempted under that language. I fear a joker in that language. I think a technicality is being made. The navigation law of 1912 that I am referring to and the two tariff laws of 1922 and of 1930, which now protect hundreds of thousands of boys and girls who use canoes along that border and the Rio Grande, are possibly not repealed by the border patrol act, using severe language, but I fear they will be evaded.



Mr. HOCH. Does the gentleman say they are or are not?

Mr. CLANCY. Possibly are not. This border patrol act side-steps and knocks over the aforesaid laws somewhat. I am most anxious to get your views and that of the Treasury Department on that.

Mr. HOCH. I say positively it does not repeal those laws.

Mr. CLANCY. Well, I know what the intention is. I state my fears. The small-boat fellow will not be required to make a report to the customs, but they report to the new border patrol. The letter from Secretary Mellon, to which the gentleman has referred, mentions new docks and the new points of entry that are to be established on the water. The other report you have says there will be none in the Great Lakes district. Now, speaking accurately, possibly the new bill does not repeal the navigation and customs laws. They will not have to report to the customs, but they will report to a new body of police. It is easy to see what they are attempting to do. The letter speaks of refusing rights to cross the border to boats violating the laws. They are attempting to catch the one-tenth of 1 per cent, 50 out of 50,000 small boats which are rum runners, and I still fear a system of permits and registration. I will ask you to clear that up.

Mr. HOCH. I hope the gentleman will conclude his statement. I do not wish to take more time of the House to-night.

Mr. SHREVE. I have been home for a week and have been up on the Lakes on what we call a booster's trip. Every year for 10 years the Erie Chamber of Commerce has been going to some Canadian port. This year we went to Midland on one of the largest ships on the lake. We landed and spent the whole day there. The people entertained us royally and I met the next Premier of Canada. Before we get through with this discussion I may tell you what he said to me. But I want to know this: Is there anything in this bill which will prevent us from having another excursion next year to some Canadian port?

Mr. HOCH. Nothing in the least.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. It will depend on the size of your boat.

Mr. HOCH. Not at all. The bill does not provide anything of the sort.

Mr. SHREVE. We landed without any examination on the part of anybody. We went back to the boat at night and again we were not examined nor disturbed in any way whatever. When we got to Mackinac the next day, customs officers went through to see if everything was legal on the boat, but it is very important to me to know before I favor this legislation whether our very joyful excursions up the Lakes are going to be interfered with.

Mr. HOCH. Not at all. I will read to the gentleman a statement made in a recent letter from the Treasury Department on that proposition:

There is nothing in the bill which affects in the slightest the duty under existing law, or the exemption from the duty, to make formal entry or to make a formal report of a vessel arriving from a foreign country.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. That does not answer the question. All the gentleman is saying now is that if he was not liable before there is no change, but under this bill the law will be tightened up so that the strict letter of the navigation laws will be carried out.

Mr. HOCH. Under the present law any boat of 15 tons or over must make both a formal entry and report on arrival. We do not interfere with that in the slightest. A boat of 15 tons or less which under the law is not permitted to carry merchandise or passengers for hire is not, under the present law, compelled to make a formal entry, but is required under the present law within 24 hours to make a report of arrival. We do not change that in the slightest degree. Under the present law a boat of 5 net tons or under must report if it brings in merchandise, but if a boat of 5 tons and less does not bring in any merchandise it does not have to make a report or formal entry. We do not intend to change that in any degree.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, it is clear there is some argument with reference to this bill. The rule provides ample time for discussion, and the bill will then be read under the 5-minute rule for amendment. I therefore move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution was agreed to.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted—

To Mr. STEVENSON, for one week, on account of illness in family.

To Mr. REECE, on account of important business.

To Mr. VINSON of Georgia, indefinitely, on account of important business.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT—BOISE NATIONAL FOREST

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the bill (H. R. 4189) to add certain lands to the Boise National Forest.

The SPEAKER. Ordered printed.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT—COLONIAL NATIONAL MONUMENT IN THE STATE OF VIRGINIA

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the bill (H. R. 12235) to provide for the creation of the Colonial National Monument in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Ordered printed.

#### FEDERAL AID TO OTHER GROUPS BESIDES FARMERS

Mr. SELVIG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SELVIG. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, much has been said about the aid the Federal Government has given and is giving to agriculture through the use of Federal funds or Federal resources. There is less known about what the Federal Government has done and is doing for other groups besides farmers.

Particularly since the recent attack on the Federal Farm Board made by the United States Chamber of Commerce has governmental assistance to agriculture been given widespread publicity.

The attack on the Federal Farm Board made by the chamber of commerce crystallized in a resolution on agricultural marketing which was adopted on May 1, 1930, at its eighteenth annual meeting held here in Washington.

I shall not digress to picture the dramatic scene when Chairman Legge of the Federal Farm Board, Secretary of Agriculture Arthur M. Hyde, the president of the Land O'Lakes Cooperative, John Brandt, of Minnesota, and others spoke in behalf of the organized farmers of the United States.

I was present at this epochal meeting. The scene will not soon be forgotten. I was proud of the spokesmen for agriculture. They rendered the producers on our farms a great service on that occasion.

Mr. Alexander Legge, chairman of the Federal Farm Board, who was the first speaker, pointed out that the marketing act committed the country to the principle of cooperative marketing. Mr. Legge added that—

There has been considerable evidence the past several months that entirely too many of your members (referring to the United States Chamber of Commerce) were for the principle of cooperation so long as it did not work.

I do not recall in years gone by of hearing you men making any such complaint against Government aid that was extended to the manufacturing industry, to transportation, and to finance. All these played their part in adding to the disadvantages of the farmer.

The opponents of the Federal Farm Board, however, had their way when the resolutions were adopted. In order that the exact language of the considered judgment of the United States Chamber of Commerce may be known, I will quote two paragraphs of the section dealing with cooperative marketing. You will note that the criticism is directed against the use of Federal funds for the benefit of agriculture.

The legislation which was enacted in June, 1929, was in contravention of the chamber's proposals in its provision of new credit facilities in the form of large sums of money from the Public Treasury to be used under the act as the Farm Board might decide. During the business crisis of some magnitude which has occurred during the last six months these funds have been brought into use in various ways.

We accordingly express our continued opposition to the use of Government funds in providing capital for the operation of agricultural cooperatives, and for the buying and selling of commodities for the purpose of attempted stabilization. We condemn as a permanent policy of government the employment of public funds for the purpose of participation in business in competition with established agencies and support the proposal for an amendment of the agricultural marketing act to repeal the authority of the Federal Farm Board to use Federal funds for such a purpose.

The attack made by the United States Chamber of Commerce was in direct conflict with its previously recorded referendum vote on the solution of the farm problem.

The referendum and result of this vote is as follows:

Resolution favoring cooperative marketing—for, 2,808; against, 111.

Resolution urging creation of the Federal Farm Board—for, 2,538; against, 563.



Many members of the chamber, high in official standing, who were parties to framing and supporting the agricultural marketing act, are to-day the leaders and the driving force behind the campaign to repeal or to emasculate it.

They oppose the use of Federal funds to assist agriculture. If the whole \$500,000,000 were lost in promoting greater production and cooperative gathering of farm products with marketing excluded, no one would ever say a word.

Billions have been given to railroad companies in the form of land grants and hundreds of millions have been loaned to them to operate their business without the slightest opposition. It was considered to be for the common welfare. Can it be that efforts to assist agriculture are to be placed in a different category?

One is led to believe that the United States Chamber of Commerce is not sincere in its advocacy of measures for the relief of our farmers. They rejected as heretical and unsound every idea that promised to go to the roots of the farm problem. The framers of the resolution condemning the Federal farm marketing act therefore had an impossible task to find a constructive substitute.

They have been able to think of nothing better than to call another farm conference.

The comments on this resolution made by the St. Paul Pioneer Press on May 2, 1930, are strictly to the point:

At this stage of the game it is hardly in order to begin from the beginning with farm relief. Between 1921 and 1929 there were nothing but farm conferences of every stripe and form. The chamber itself had an excellent one. It came to the conclusion that cooperative marketing was the thing. But now the chamber discovers that the only kind of cooperative marketing it is willing to permit the farmers to do would be the brand which leaves all the previous agencies of marketing unaffected. How the chamber expects the farmers to do their own marketing and the private dealers also to do the same marketing is too much for comprehension.

But the chamber can hardly expect to be taken seriously in its assault on the farm board when it has nothing better to offer in its place than another farm conference. The first positive farm relief that has materialized into action is based on the principle of cooperation among the farmers. They alone of all classes of producers have had nothing to say about disposing of their own products. Farm marketing is not done by farmers, but by specialized middlemen who exercise the real and crucial control. Now an attempt is being made to organize the farm-marketing system on a producer basis. That attempt is not going to be abandoned until Congress is ready to put something more direct, more thoroughgoing, more fundamental in its place, for example, the McNary-Haugen bill.

It is not my intention to-day to enter into a detailed discussion of the plans and performance of the Federal Farm Board. The board has been in existence less than a year. It is yet too early to know definitely what the board may be able to accomplish. In passing, I may state that nothing has transpired to change my opinion regarding the Federal farm marketing act which I fully set forth on the floor of the House of Representatives April 20, 1929, when the bill was under consideration.

What I desire to do is to call to the attention of the country facts regarding governmental aid that has been given to other groups. The subject will be divided as follows:

- First. Federal aid for the railroads.
- Second. Federal aid for waterways transportation.
- Third. Federal aid for mail subsidies to American ships.
- Fourth. Federal aid for the banking interests.

#### FEDERAL AID FOR THE RAILROADS

Approximately 280,000,000 acres of public lands were donated to the railroads by Congress in 83 legislative acts passed in the period, September 20, 1850 to March 3, 1871. Some of this land was donated by the Federal Government to the States that in turn gave it to the railroads, but the majority of it was given to the railroads directly. These grants of land were given for the purpose of helping private railroad companies to construct and maintain railroad lines.

Bonds were issued by the Federal Government to various specified railroad systems in amounts which were virtually sufficient to underwrite and finance the construction of these railroads. The railroads were obligated, of course, to repay the money to the Government. The distribution of these bonds to the railroads was on the basis of \$16,000 worth of bonds per mile of railroad constructed between the Missouri River and the eastern base of the Rocky Mountains and between the Pacific Ocean and the western base of the Sierra Nevada Mountains and from \$32,000 to \$48,000 worth of bonds per mile between the western base of the Sierra Nevada Mountains and the eastern base of the Rocky Mountains.

#### RECENT LEGISLATION

In the transportation act of 1920 Congress authorized an equalization-fee plan for the railroad industry. An equalization fund was authorized to be built up by exacting equalization charges from railroads receiving excess returns and this equalization fund was to be used for loans at less than market interest to railroads suffering losses through earning less than the fair return prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Federal control of the railroads cost the Federal Government approximately \$2,000,000,000.

Those who now criticize the policies laid down by Congress for the guidance of the Farm Board have short memories when they fail to recall what Uncle Sam has done for the railroads. I have barely scratched the surface in making these observations. Volumes have been written recounting in detail the specific grants of land and moneys to build up our transportation systems and, incidentally, to build up a great many millionaires' fortunes. Those who oppose Federal aid for agriculture are reminded that agriculture is our Nation's greatest industry and that our self-interest demands that it be encouraged and strengthened in every way possible.

Another group has benefited greatly by Federal aid. I refer to the vast sums expended for waterways transportation.

#### FEDERAL AID FOR WATERWAY TRANSPORTATION

The Federal Government donated 4,597,668 acres of land to the States of Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan between March 2, 1827, and July 3, 1866, for the purpose of encouraging the building of canals.

A total of 2,245,252 acres of land was granted by the Federal Government to the States of Alabama, Wisconsin, and Iowa between May 23, 1828, and July 12, 1862, for the improvement of rivers.

The Federal Government has expended a total of approximately \$1,290,000,000 for the development and improvement of rivers and harbors in the United States up to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929. This work, done at the expense of the Federal Treasury, has been of enormous benefit to the private shipping interests.

The Federal Government has also expended a total of \$210,000,000 for flood control up to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929. This work, paid for by the Federal Treasury, has also been a distinct benefit to American business interests in the localities affected.

A total of approximately 400,000 acres of public land was given to the State of Alabama by the act of May 23, 1828, for the development of the Tennessee River at Muscle Shoals and other localities.

The Federal Government up to December 31, 1829, had subscribed to canal stock in various companies in amounts which totaled \$1,263,315.65. The Government took stock in the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal Co. in 1825, the Louisville & Portland Canal Co. in 1826, the Dismal Swamp Co. in 1826, and the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal Co. in 1828.

Up to the present time the Federal Government has purchased with Federal funds a total of \$15,000,000 worth of stock in the Inland Waterway Corporation for the development of barge lines on the Mississippi River and the Warrior River.

There has been a feeble outcry against the Federal Government's participation in this development. I am not criticizing the policy of the Federal Government in this regard. Far from it. I am merely pointing out that it has become almost a habit on the part of Uncle Sam to make huge financial grants for these purposes.

If this is beneficial to the country at large, which no one will deny, then, by all that is right and fair and just, agriculture's claims ought to be given sympathetic consideration. The vast and powerful group of the organized business and wealth of the Nation should get behind a program to give agriculture a place in the sun.

Perhaps no group has received more handsome treatment from the Federal Government than has the American merchant marine. Let us look into this phase next.

#### FEDERAL AID FOR AN AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

The private shipping interests interested in coastwise shipping and oceanic shipping have been aided by the Federal Government through numerous legislative acts. Among those providing financial assistance the following are cited:

Ever since the act of Congress of March 1, 1817 (R. S. 4347) ships flying the American flag have been given an exclusive monopoly of the coastwise trade. For many years prior to that date they had enjoyed a virtual monopoly by reason of the taxes exacted on ships flying foreign flags. This single legislative enactment has been of enormous financial advantage to American shipyards and to American shipping. The coastwise



trade of the United States includes not only the trade along the coasts of continental United States but also between these regions and Alaska, Hawaii, and Porto Rico and it is estimated that the freight tonnage carried in this trade exceeds the total freight carried by all the ships combined of any other single country excepting possibly Great Britain.

#### BILLIONS FOR SHIPS

During the 6-year period from September 7, 1916 to June 30, 1923, the Federal Government spent \$3,491,928,650 in the construction and acquiring of merchant ships and otherwise developing an American merchant marine. This expenditure of Federal funds, it is estimated, exceeds all of the subsidies, subventions, and bounties combined of all the countries of the world during the 80-year period following the granting of the first subsidy to the Cunard Steamship Line.

It is significant to note that out of the 2,311 ships totaling 13,627,311 dead-weight tons which were completed up to May, 1922 with Federal funds, only 583 ships totaling 3,331,021 tons were completed prior to 1919. In other words most of the ships which were constructed with Federal funds were not completed until after the close of the war, the program of building continuing for several years following the war. After the close of the war, the cancellations of contracts for construction represented only a small percentage of the total amount of tonnage finally completed.

#### GOVERNMENT LOSSES RUN INTO MILLIONS

Since the construction of this fleet by the Government, a large number of ships have been disposed of for amounts which represent only a small proportion of the original cost. The 285 ships in the fleet of wooden vessels was disposed of at a price less than 3 per cent of their first cost, thereby entailing a loss to the Government of approximately \$300,000,000. In the fiscal years ending June 30, 1922 and 1923, steel vessels were being disposed of at prices aggregating \$35,250,000. It has been estimated that if the Shipping Board had sold all of the remaining steel fleet upon this scale of values, it would have brought only \$270,000,000, excluding the ex-German steamers.

The Federal Government incurred a total loss of \$14,434,000 during 1929 by Government operation of the merchant marine.

The development of the American merchant marine from a comparatively small tonnage to a large tonnage, the establishment of trade routes and shipping lines has been done under the announced intention of developing an American merchant marine which ultimately will be turned over to private ownership and operation. This purpose is now in the process of being fulfilled. With the exception of the emergency requirements of the war period these expenditures of Federal funds have been made primarily for the ultimate purpose of aiding in the development of an American merchant marine to be composed of private shipping owned and operated by private interests.

#### EMERGENCY FLEET CORPORATION

In 1916 Congress passed a shipping act which, among other things, authorized the Shipping Board to organize a corporation—the Emergency Fleet Corporation—to purchase, construct, charter, and maintain merchant vessels. The corporation was to have a capital stock of not to exceed \$50,000,000, of which the Shipping Board was required to subscribe at least a majority of the stock out of Federal funds, and the sale of \$50,000,000 in Panama Canal bonds was authorized to be sold to provide funds for this purpose. As a matter of fact, the Government has owned practically all of the stock of this corporation except a few shares to qualify directors.

#### LOANS TO PRIVATE SHIPPING INTERESTS

The merchant marine act of 1920 provided for a construction loan fund to be raised by an annual contribution of \$25,000,000 for five years from the proceeds of sales and operations. This money was to be loaned to private shipping interests for the construction of ships and loans could be made up to two-thirds of the cost of construction.

Tax exemptions for a 10-year period was given to American shipowners under the transportation act of 1920, provided they invested in the construction of new ships not less than the amount of the exemption received.

Congress has granted free entry on all materials necessary for the construction, equipment, and repair of ships in American shipyards, in all tariff acts since 1894. Prior to that time free entry had been provided for the materials used in wooden ships in the act of June 6, 1872, and this was further extended to include certain steel materials in the act of February 8, 1875, and still further extended by the acts of 1890 and 1894.

#### MAIL SUBSIDIES

By an act of Congress, May 3, 1845, mail subsidies to ships of American construction were authorized in the form of liberal payments per letter and package rather than a mileage or route payment.

During the period 1847-1858, the Federal Government, it is estimated, paid a total of \$14,400,000 in mail subsidies to American shipping interests, according to Meeker, History of Shipping Subsidies, on page 156. Among these payments was a 5-year contract between the Government and the Ocean Steam Navigation Co. for mail service between New York and Bremen and between New York and Havre, whereby the Government agreed to pay \$100,000 per year for each ship making a round trip voyage every two months between New York and Bremen, and \$75,000 per year for every ship making a round-trip voyage between New York and Havre. The steamship company in order to obtain these benefits agreed to build, within one year, four first-class steamships having a tonnage of at least 1,400 tons and with engines of at least 1,000 horsepower and capable of a greater speed than boats of the Cunard Line. Some modifications in this contract were made later.

#### THE E. K. COLLINS LINE CONTRACT

The E. K. Collins Line was given a contract by the Government for service between New York and Liverpool whereby this firm received from the Government a compensation of \$19,250 for 20 round-trip voyages or a total of \$385,000 per year. The company was required to put into service five steamers of not less than 2,000 tons each with engines of not less than 1,000 horsepower. Service started in 1850. In 1852, Great Britain increased the Cunard subvention to approximately \$843,559 for 52 round trips per year, whereupon the United States increased its subsidy to the Collins Line to \$853,000 for 26 voyages. In 1856 Congress reduced the subsidy to the Collins Line and in 1858 withdrew it entirely, paying only for the actual mail carried.

#### PACIFIC MAIL STEAMSHIP CO.

During the 10-year period, 1865 to 1874, the Pacific Mail Steamship Co. received a total of \$4,583,333 in subsidies from the Federal Government for the maintenance of mail steamship service. By an act of Congress, February 17, 1865, it received an annual subvention of \$500,000 in a 10-year contract for service between San Francisco and ports in China and Japan. It began operations in 1867. In 1872 it proposed another mail steamship line to China and Japan and received an additional subvention from the Government of \$500,000 per year.

By an act of Congress, May 3, 1875, however, this subvention was repealed when it was discovered that it had been approved as a result of corruption and that the company had not carried out its agreement. By the act of May 28, 1864, Congress authorized an annual subsidy of \$250,000 for the establishment of a monthly mail steamship service between Philadelphia and Rio de Janeiro for which the United States was to pay \$150,000 and Brazil \$100,000. This line was continued from 1865 to 1876.

The Government also negotiated a contract with the California, Oregon & Mexico Line for the operation of a Hawaiian service for which the Government was to pay \$75,000 annually.

#### MORE MAIL CONTRACTS IN 1891

By the act of Congress, March 3, 1891, aid to the American Merchant Marine was authorized in the form of mail contracts whereby the compensation to the carriers was to be based on the type of construction, tonnage, and speed of the vessel on a basis ranging from 66⅔ cents per mile on Class IV vessels to \$4 per mile on Class I vessels, provided the vessels (except Class IV) were built in American shipyards under the supervision of naval authorities and subject to requisition in time of war.

Under this act the Government has paid out a considerable amount of money to private shipping interests for carrying the mails, in excess of the cost of carrying the same amount of mail if it had been paid for on the basis of weight rather than the contract basis provided for under this act. According to the annual report of the Second Assistant Postmaster General in 1915, on page 25:

The fiscal year of 1914 was the first year in the more than 20 years of service under the act of 1891 that the cost of the contract service was less than the conveying steamers would have received on the weight basis for conveying the same amount of mail.

By 1914, therefore, the subventions under the act of 1891 were practically eliminated by following the policy of restricting the carrying of the mails more and more to contract ships rather than to noncontract ships.

#### CONSTRUCTION LOAN FUND IN ACT OF 1928

The merchant marine act of 1928 authorized the increase by Federal appropriations of the construction loan fund of the Shipping Board from \$125,000,000 to \$250,000,000. Loans from this fund can be made to American citizens for the construction in American shipyards of vessels for American shipping lines. These loans can be made on a 20-year basis at a minimum rate



of interest of  $5\frac{1}{4}$  per cent when such a vessel is operated exclusively in coastwise trade or is inactive and at the lowest Government rate of Government obligations when the vessel is operated in foreign trade. Such loans can be made up to three-fourths of the cost of the vessel.

#### MAIL CONTRACTS INCLUDED

This act also authorized the Postmaster General to certify to the Shipping Board what mail routes should be established and to enter into mail contracts not to exceed 10 years in length under specified compensation based on the speed and tonnage of the vessels and ranging from \$1.50 per nautical mile for class 7 vessels to \$12 per nautical mile for class 1 vessels or even higher compensation in the discretion of the Postmaster General for vessels of class 1 with a speed of more than 24 knots.

The approximate cost of carrying the mails for one year under the contracts awarded by the Government under the merchant marine act of 1928 is \$13,018,220 as compared to a cost of \$2,319,351 if the mails were carried on noncontract vessels on a weight basis. In other words, the Federal Government is subsidizing 25 steamship companies to the amount of \$10,698,869 annually by means of mail contracts with these companies.

This extended summary clearly indicates what the policy of the Federal Government has been for more than 100 years. The specific laws and grants mentioned speak for themselves. It ill becomes those who have supported these measures to raise their voice against cooperation by the Federal Government in attempting to assist agriculture. The precedents for financial aid by the Federal Government to the groups financially interested in the shipping business are conclusive as to the Government's policy.

#### FEDERAL AID FOR THE BANKING INTERESTS

The Government has aided the banking interests of the country through its deposits of Federal funds in banking institutions. For the period 1837-1846 Federal funds were deposited chiefly in State and private banks. For the next 20 years a system of subtreasuries was maintained for the deposit of Federal funds. During the period 1864-1913, Federal funds were deposited principally in national banks which were private institutions recognized by law as Government agents.

Deposits of Federal funds in national banks are in reality loans of Federal funds, on which the banks pay interest and for which they furnish security. When the Federal reserve act was passed in 1913 there were 850 regular depositaries and 685 depositaries holding \$76,000,000 of Federal funds. Upon the passage of the Federal reserve act most of the Government funds deposited in the 12 States in which the Federal reserve banks were located were transferred to the Federal reserve banks. During the war, however, the use of national banks and other banking institutions as depositaries by the Government greatly increased, so that by the middle of November, 1917, 1,903 national banks and 1,343 State banks and trust companies served as Federal depositaries. At the end of the fiscal year 1917 Federal funds were deposited as follows:

In Treasury offices.....	\$107,662,956
In Federal reserve banks.....	300,671,632
In special depositaries.....	783,922,959
In regular depositaries.....	49,681,738
In Philippine treasury.....	2,081,409

With the final abolishment of the subtreasury system in 1920 the Federal deposits in Federal reserve banks were augmented.

#### FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

In 1913 Congress passed the Federal reserve act, which authorized an organization committee composed of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Comptroller of the Currency to organize a Federal reserve system comprised of 12 Federal reserve banks regionally constituted. The law required all national banks either to join the system or to relinquish their status as Federal fiscal agents and forfeit all rights given to national banks. If the subscription from national banks was not sufficient to organize the 12 Federal reserve banks, the organization committee was empowered to solicit public subscriptions, and if this did not bring sufficient funds the Government was authorized to buy as much stock as the organization committee determined was necessary. The national banks were required to subscribe for capital stock in the Federal reserve banks equal to 6 per cent of the paid-up capital stock and surplus of such national banks.

These Federal reserve banks, although organized by the Government, are really private institutions owned and operated by the member banks holding their capital stock. The Federal Government, after establishing the reserve banks, has exercised a regulatory function over their operations by means of a Federal Reserve Board, which is appointed by the President. The Government also maintains a voice in the management of the

reserve banks by means of the provision in the law which requires that three of the nine directors of each reserve bank must be appointed by the Federal Reserve Board. The Federal Reserve Board also participates in the management of the system through its power to regulate the rediscount rate.

Thus the Federal Government has organized and helped to maintain by means of the deposit of Federal funds and the regulatory system of the Federal Reserve Board and the directors appointed by it a national banking system to stabilize and promote the banking industry in the United States.

When the cry is raised against the use of Federal funds for the benefit of our farmers, let the opponents explain away this record of Federal financial aid to railways, in behalf of waterways transportation, for mail subsidies to American ships, and for the vast banking interests.

#### AGRICULTURE DESERVES SQUARE DEAL

I believe the American people are willing to give a square deal to the farmers. It was the intent of Congress to give the American producer the benefit of the world price plus the tariff duty; otherwise why pass a Federal farm marketing act at all?

Instead of criticizing the Federal Farm Board, which has become the habit of many, all should join hands in giving it additional authority to accomplish what the farm organizations and the producers of the country demand. I believe such authority is necessary before there can be definite improvement in the prices received for surplus farm products.

The millions of our producers rejoice in having the issue placed squarely before the American people. Only in this way can a true solution be attained. Spokesmen for agriculture realize that the fight for farm equality must go on. No problem is settled until it is settled right.

The 5-minute speech made by National Master Louis J. Taber, of the National Grange, at the May 1, 1930, meeting of the United States Chamber of Commerce is so definite and expresses the issue so clearly that I wish to include it in my remarks:

I will not use the brief time allotted me to defend Chairman Legge, the Farm Board, or the Secretary of Agriculture, as they need no defense. However, as master of the National Grange, speaking for its almost 1,000,000 members, I must insist that business men on the farms shall be treated the same as business men in town. Prosperity can come only because of the teamwork and understanding, and not because some special class may enjoy legislative or unfair governmental assistance.

With all of the earnestness at my command I want to urge this great body not to pass the proposed resolution criticizing the Federal Farm Board and cooperative marketing. The National Grange has been on record for more than 60 years demanding equality for agriculture. During recent years we have sought to secure this equality by advocating the export-debenture program. I must remind you that your organization has given us no assistance in securing this type of legislation. On the other hand, your members have sought to defeat all farm-relief legislation advocated by organized agriculture. At the same time, you and your members favored the Federal marketing act, you would not allow us to have our kind of farm relief, so now don't desert your own child!

The National Grange tried to secure a better farm marketing bill. We wanted to strengthen it by including the export debenture; you helped defeat us. I want to say to Chairman Legge and to this group, the Grange does not sulk, but we do work and continue the good fight. We will support to the limit the marketing act. We ask others to do likewise, yet we serve notice we will never cease to fight for a square deal for the men and women who grow the food and fiber of mankind.

I was interested in the statement just made, that business asks no favors of Congress, and wants no special legislation in its behalf. "By their fruits ye shall know them," said a great prophet. I want to look this crowd in the face and say that for 15 months some of us have been compelled to leave our homes and our work and to stay in Washington, to help secure a square deal in the tariff. The representatives of agriculture have done their best but they have been overwhelmed by business interests. The business leaders before me have secured 2,000 amendments and increases in the pending tariff act, while the farmer received but 200. Yet the President called Congress not to enact a tariff in your interest but to pass an agricultural tariff. You secured 10 increases to our 1. If this is not asking Government favor and Government assistance, what is it?

There has been criticism of the Federal Farm Board loaning money to the farmer. It is stated this is unfair to business. Apparently some of you have not read the Jones-White shipping bill, advocated by the commercial interests of the Nation, which provides loans for shipbuilders of millions of dollars at 4 per cent or less. If this is fair for business, is it not fair for agriculture?

In the name of our basic producers, we demand that if business is to enjoy its Cummins-Esch law, the Federal reserve act, and its high-tariff rates; if labor is to have restricted immigration, then common justice demands equal opportunities for agriculture. Do not indicate by your



vote to-day as business men that the laws of our land and the protection of government shall be given to business, commerce, and labor, but that agriculture shall be left out in the cold. Do not indicate that the protecting folds of our flag do not reach the tillers of the soil.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that to-morrow, following the other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that to-morrow, following the other special orders, he may be permitted to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on veterans' legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CONNERY. I object.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 396. An act for the relief of J. H. Muus;  
H. R. 414. An act for the relief of Angelo Cerri;  
H. R. 597. An act for the relief of M. L. Willis;  
H. R. 609. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay certain moneys to James McCann;

H. R. 864. An act for the relief of W. P. Thompson;  
H. R. 1174. An act for the relief of A. N. Worstell;  
H. R. 1485. An act for the relief of Arthur H. Thiel;  
H. R. 1509. An act for the relief of Maude L. Duborg;  
H. R. 1510. An act for the relief of Thomas T. Grimsley;  
H. R. 1739. An act for the relief of J. A. Miller;  
H. R. 2021. An act to authorize the establishment of boundary lines for the March Field Military Reservation, Calif.;  
H. R. 2166. An act for the relief of Mrs. W. M. Kittle;  
H. R. 2167. An act for the relief of Sarah E. Edge;  
H. R. 2810. An act for the relief of Katherine Anderson;  
H. R. 3431. An act for the relief of Charles H. Young;  
H. R. 6347. An act to amend section 101 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 28, sec. 182);

H. R. 6718. An act for the relief of Michael J. Bauman;  
H. R. 10461. An act authorizing Royce Kershaw, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Coosa River at or near Gilberts Ferry, about 8 miles southwest of Gadsden, in Etowah County, Ala.;

H. R. 11515. An act to provide for the sale of the Government building site located on the State line dividing West Point, Ga., and Lanett, Ala., and for the acquisition of new sites and construction of Government buildings thereon in such cities;

H. R. 12343. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to accept donations of sites for public buildings; and

H. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution to provide for the annual contribution of the United States toward the support of the Central Bureau of the International Map of the World on the Millionth Scale.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 525. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to loan to the Louisiana State Museum, of the city of New Orleans, La., the silver service in use on the cruiser *New Orleans*;

S. 1959. An act to authorize the creation of game sanctuaries or refuges within the Ocala National Forest in the State of Florida;

S. 3068. An act to amend section 355 of the Revised Statutes to permit the Attorney General to accept certificates of title in the purchase of land by the United States in certain cases;

S. 3422. An act to authorize the Tidewater Toll Properties (Inc.), its legal representatives and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Patuxent River, south of Burch, Calvert County, Md.;

S. 3623. An act for reimbursement of James R. Sheffield, formerly American ambassador to Mexico City;

S. 4164. An act authorizing the repayment of rents and royalties in excess of requirements made under leases executed in accordance with the general leasing act of February 25, 1920; and

S. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution for the payment of certain employees of the United States Government in the District of Columbia and employees of the District of Columbia for March 4, 1929.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 320. An act for the relief of Haskins & Sells;  
H. R. 328. An act for the relief of Parke, Davis & Co.;  
H. R. 329. An act for the relief of Joseph A. McEvoy;  
H. R. 396. An act for the relief of J. H. Muus;  
H. R. 414. An act for the relief of Angelo Cerri;  
H. R. 471. An act for the relief of Luther W. Guerin;  
H. R. 597. An act for the relief of M. L. Willis;  
H. R. 609. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay certain moneys to James McCann;

H. R. 655. An act for the relief of Guy E. Tuttle;  
H. R. 704. An act to grant relief to those States which brought state-owned property into the Federal service in 1917;

H. R. 864. An act for the relief of W. P. Thompson;  
H. R. 1058. An act for the relief of Jesse A. Frost;  
H. R. 1076. An act for the relief of Jacob S. Steloff;  
H. R. 1174. An act for the relief of A. N. Worstell;  
H. R. 1485. An act for the relief of Arthur H. Thiel;  
H. R. 1509. An act for the relief of Maude L. Duborg;  
H. R. 1510. An act for the relief of Thomas T. Grimsley;  
H. R. 1546. An act for the relief of Thomas Seltzer;  
H. R. 1592. An act for the relief of William Meyer;  
H. R. 1696. An act for the relief of Lieut. Timothy J. Mulcahy, Supply Corps, United States Navy;

H. R. 1712. An act for the relief of the heirs of Jacob Gussin;  
H. R. 1717. An act for the relief of F. G. Baum;  
H. R. 1724. An act for the relief of Margaret Lemley;  
H. R. 1739. An act for the relief of J. A. Miller;  
H. R. 1888. An act for the relief of Rose Lea Comstock;

H. R. 2021. An act to authorize the establishment of boundary lines for the March Field Military Reservation, Calif.;  
H. R. 2166. An act for the relief of Mrs. W. M. Kittle;  
H. R. 2167. An act for the relief of Sarah E. Edge;  
H. R. 2464. An act for the relief of Paul A. Hodapp;  
H. R. 2645. An act for the relief of Homer Elmer Cox;  
H. R. 2755. An act to increase the efficiency of the Veterinary Corps of the Regular Army;

H. R. 2776. An act for the relief of Dr. Charles F. Dewitz;  
H. R. 2810. An act for the relief of Katherine Anderson;  
H. R. 3072. An act for the relief of Peterson-Colwell (Inc.);  
H. R. 3222. An act for the relief of the State of Vermont;  
H. R. 3431. An act for the relief of Charles H. Young;  
H. R. 3441. An act for the relief of Meta S. Wilkinson;  
H. R. 3732. An act for the relief of Fernando Montilla;  
H. R. 5113. An act for the relief of Sylvester J. Easlick;  
H. R. 5459. An act for the relief of Topa Topa Ranch Co., Glencoe Ranch Co., Arthur J. Koenigstein, and H. Fukasawa;

H. R. 5526. An act for the relief of Fred S. Thompson;  
H. R. 5872. An act for the relief of Ray Wilson;  
H. R. 5962. An act for the relief of R. E. Marshall;  
H. R. 6209. An act for the relief of Dalton G. Miller;  
H. R. 6210. An act to authorize an appropriation for the relief of Joseph K. Munhall;

H. R. 6243. An act for the relief of A. E. Bickley;  
H. R. 6264. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to donate a bronze cannon to the town of Avon, Mass.;

H. R. 6268. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Parker;  
H. R. 6340. An act to authorize an appropriation for construction at the Mountain Branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, Johnson City, Tenn.;

H. R. 6347. An act to amend section 101 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 28, sec. 182);

H. R. 6416. An act for the relief of Myrtle M. Hitzing;  
H. R. 6537. An act for the relief of Prentice O'Rear;  
H. R. 6627. An act for the relief of A. C. Elmore;  
H. R. 6663. An act for the relief of J. N. Lewis;  
H. R. 6718. An act for the relief of Michael J. Bauman;  
H. R. 6825. An act to extend the measure of relief provided in the employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Robert W. Vail;

H. R. 6871. An act to amend the acts of March 12, 1926, and March 30, 1928, authorizing the sale of the Jackson Barracks Military Reservation, La., and for other purposes;

H. R. 7013. An act for the relief of Howard Perry;  
H. R. 7026. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fanor Flores and Pedro Flores;

H. R. 7027. An act for the relief of Paul Franz, torpedoman, third class, United States Navy;

H. R. 7068. An act for the relief of Fred Schwarz, jr.;

H. R. 7638. An act to authorize the acquisition for military purposes of land in the county of Montgomery, State of Alabama, for use as an addition to Maxwell Field;



H. R. 7664. An act to authorize payment of fees to M. L. Flow, United States commissioner, of Monroe, N. C., for services rendered after his commission expired and before a new commission was issued for reappointment;

H. R. 8347. An act for the relief of the Palmer Fish Co.;

H. R. 8393. An act to authorize the Court of Claims to correct an error in claim of Charles G. Mettler;

H. R. 8491. An act for the relief of Bryan Sparks and L. V. Hahn;

H. R. 9246. An act to reimburse Lieut. Col. Frank J. Killilea;

H. R. 9280. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant a right of way for street purposes upon and across the Holabird Quartermaster Depot Military Reservation, in the State of Maryland;

H. R. 9628. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Arkansas, through its State highway department, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across St. Francis River at or near Lake City, Ark., on State Highway No. 18;

H. R. 9990. An act for the rehabilitation of the Bitter Root irrigation project, Montana;

H. R. 10209. An act authorizing the appropriation of \$2,500 for the erection of a marker or tablet at Jasper Spring, Chatham County, Ga., to mark the spot where Sergt. William Jasper, a Revolutionary hero, fell;

H. R. 10376. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Kansas City, Kans.;

H. R. 10461. An act authorizing Royce Kershaw, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Coosa River at or near Gilberts Ferry, about eight miles southwest of Gadsden, in Etowah County, Ala.;

H. R. 10826. An act to provide for the renewal of passports;

H. R. 10919. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States, and of Elise Steinger, housekeeper for Consul R. A. Wallace Treat at the Smyrna consulate, who while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of Government funds and/or personal property by reason of theft, warlike conditions, catastrophes of nature, shipwreck, or other causes;

H. R. 11088. An act for the refund of money erroneously collected from Thomas Griffith, of Peach Creek, W. Va.;

H. R. 11145. An act to increase the authorization for an appropriation for the expenses of the sixth session of the Permanent International Association of Road Congresses to be held in the District of Columbia in October, 1930;

H. R. 11371. An act to provide living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, for civilian officers and employees of the Government stationed in foreign countries;

H. R. 11405. An act to amend an act approved February 25, 1929, entitled "An act to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes";

H. R. 11477. An act for the relief of Clifford J. Turner;

H. R. 11493. An act to reimburse Lt. Col. Charles F. Sargent;

H. R. 11515. An act to provide for the sale of the Government building site located on the State line dividing West Point, Ga., and Lanett, Ala., and for the acquisition of new sites and construction of Government buildings thereon in such cities;

H. R. 12099. An act to apply the pension laws to the Coast Guard;

H. R. 12263. An act to authorize the acquisition of 1,000 acres of land, more or less, for aerial bombing range purposes at Kelly Field, Tex., and in settlement of certain damage claims;

H. R. 12586. An act granting an increase of pension to Josefa T. Philips;

H. R. 12663. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Texas & Pacific Railway Co. to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across Sulphur River in the State of Arkansas near Fort Lynn;

H. R. 12842. An act to create an additional judge for the southern district of Florida;

H. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution to provide for the annual contribution of the United States toward the support of the Central Bureau of the International Map of the World on the Millionth Scale;

H. J. Res. 306. Joint resolution establishing a commission for the participation of the United States in the observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, authorizing an appropriation to be utilized in connection with such observance, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 322. Joint resolution authorizing payment of the claim of the Norwegian Government for interest upon money advanced by it in connection with the protection of American interests in Russia.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, June 27, 1930, at 12 o'clock noon.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BRITTEN: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 1190. A bill to regulate the distribution and promotion of commissioned officers of the line of the Navy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2029). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 11967. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Illinois; without amendment (Rept. No. 2030). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3064. An act to make permanent the additional office of district judge created for the eastern district of Illinois by the act of September 14, 1922; without amendment (Rept. No. 2031). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DYER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3060. An act to provide for the establishment of a national employment system and for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such system, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2033). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 10545. A bill for the relief of John S. Abbott; without amendment (Rept. No. 2032). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 13174) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MAPES (by request): A bill (H. R. 13175) to amend section 16a of the interstate commerce act by inserting (1) at the beginning thereof and by adding thereto a new paragraph numbered (2); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BACON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 387) proposing an amendment to the Constitution to amend the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOOD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 388) making provision for continuation of construction of the United States Supreme Court Building; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HILL of Alabama: Resolution (H. Res. 273) relative to the sale of power generated by the Government power plant at Wilson Dam; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS: Resolution (H. Res. 274) that there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House an additional sum not to exceed \$25,000 in carrying out the provisions of House Resolution 114; to the Committee on Accounts.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 275) that there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House not to exceed \$10,000 for the expenses of the select committee appointed under House Resolution 258 to investigate campaign expenditures of the various candidates for the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. ALMON: Resolution (H. Res. 276) relating to the disposition of power generated by the Government power plant at Wilson Dam; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARENTZ: A bill (H. R. 13176) for the relief of Edward J. Webster; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 13177) granting an increase of pension to Matilda Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.



By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 13178) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ellen Powell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 13179) granting a pension to Jennie Sands; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHINDBLOM: A bill (H. R. 13180) for the relief of Paul G. Lorenz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COYLE: A bill (H. R. 13181) granting an increase of pension to Howard L. Rader; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALL of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 13182) granting an increase of pension to Emma Welch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 13183) granting an increase of pension to Rhoda Button; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 13184) granting a pension to Emma Stark Derr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 13185) granting a pension to Sarah K. Copeland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 13186) granting a pension to Andrew Stoner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 13187) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Ellen Cohn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WYANT: A bill (H. R. 13188) granting a pension to Alice Loughner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

7654. Petition of Sons of Confederate Veterans, at its thirty-fifth annual convention, which was held at Biloxi, Miss., expressing their appreciation to the President of the United States of America in his signing of the bill and making it possible for this great addition to our reunion; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

7655. By Mr. BARBOUR: Telegram in behalf of twenty-first district, California, Congress of Parents and Teachers, urging passage of the Hudson bill (H. R. 9986) for the regulation of the moving-picture industry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7656. By Mr. BLACKBURN: Petition of Railway Labor Executive's Association, signed by D. B. Robertson, chairman, urging the passage of the Couzens-Knutson resolution to stop further consolidation of railroads until Congress has enacted legislation to protect the public interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7657. By Mr. CULLEN: Resolution of the New York State Bankers' Association, indorsing House bill 12490, introduced by Mr. GOODWIN, of Minnesota; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7658. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Steel Sales Corporation, 129 South Jefferson Street, Chicago, Ill., urging the defeat of House bill 11096, relative to increase of postal rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7659. Also, petition of Bear & Brodie, Madison Street and Western Avenue, Chicago, Ill., protesting against the passage of House bill 11096, as in their opinion this legislation will not benefit anyone; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7660. Also, petition of John E. Baumrucker Co., 31 North State Street, Chicago, Ill., requesting the defeat of House bill 11096, as this is, in their opinion, unfair and unjust; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7661. Also, petition of Thomas Chorow, jr., president Old Glory Manufacturing & Decorating Co., 504-506 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill., strongly opposing House bill 11096 and urging its defeat; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7662. Also, petition of L. M. Cobler, M. D., 190 North State Street, Chicago, Ill., urging the defeat of House bill 11096, as in his opinion it will not better the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7663. Also, petition of the N. Sure Co., wholesale general merchandise, Adams and Wells Streets, Chicago, Ill., unalterably opposed to House bill 11096 and urging the defeat of the above bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7664. Also, petition of Plibrico Jointless Firebrick Co., 1800 Kingsbury Street, Chicago, Ill., protesting against the passage of House bill 11096; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7665. Also, petition of the Reinauer Manufacturing Co. (Inc.), 1001-1016 West Washington Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., urging the defeat of House bill 11096, as in their opinion it is not good legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7666. Also, petition of Victor A. Olander, secretary-treasurer Illinois State Federation of Labor, Chicago, Ill., earnestly requesting the immediate passage of the Saturday half holiday bill; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

#### SENATE

FRIDAY, June 27, 1930

Rev. James W. Morris, D. D., assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Lord God of hope and peace, fill us, we pray Thee, with all joy and peace in believing, making us to abound in hope by the power of the Holy Spirit.

Let not any selfish disloyalty or menacing lawlessness that may disturb our land lead us to faithless fear or unfilial distrust. Endue with humility of spirit, calmness of judgment, and staunchness of will all those in authority over us that so by their endeavors our mighty Government, both at home and abroad, may be "first pure, then peaceable, forbearing, full of mercy and good fruits, that thus the fruit of righteousness may be sown in peace of them that make peace."

We ask these things in the name of Thy Son, who is our hope and our peace. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. FESS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Fess	McCulloch	Simmons
Ashurst	George	McKellar	Steck
Barkley	Gillett	McNary	Stelwer
Bingham	Glass	Metcalf	Stephens
Black	Glenn	Moses	Sullivan
Blaine	Goldsborough	Norris	Swanson
Borah	Hale	Oddie	Thomas, Idaho
Brock	Harris	Overman	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Harrison	Patterson	Townsend
Broussard	Hastings	Phipps	Trammell
Capper	Hatfield	Pine	Tydings
Caraway	Hayden	Pittman	Vandenberg
Connally	Hebert	Ransdell	Wagner
Copeland	Howell	Reed	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.	Walsh, Mont.
Cutting	Jones	Robison, Ky.	Watson
Dale	Kean	Sheppard	
Deneen	Kendrick	Shipstead	
Dill	La Follette	Shortridge	

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES] are necessarily detained from the Senate by illness.

The junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BLEASE] and the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON] are necessarily detained from the Senate by reason of illness in their families.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL]. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

#### CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when we conclude the routine morning business we proceed to the calendar for the consideration of unobjected bills.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, may I ask if it is the intention of the Senator to begin where we left off on the last call?

Mr. McNARY. I should have asked that we begin at order 1126, where we left off on the last call of the calendar.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator whether in his judgment we shall be able to reach those bills which were passed over on yesterday?

Mr. McNARY. Order of Business 1126 is on the next to the last page of the calendar, and then we will commence at the beginning of the calendar.

Mr. FESS. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.